

The CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and CLASSICAL REVIEW are the organs of the Classical Association.
For the present the QUARTERLY will be published in two DOUBLE numbers in April and October;
the times of publication of the REVIEW are variable under prevailing conditions.

The Classical Review

PERIODICAL ROOM
GENERAL LIBRARY
UNIV. OF MICH.

P

Editors | C. J. FORDYCE, M.A., 3 The University, Glasgow, W. 2
R. M. RATTENBURY, M.A., Trinity College, Cambridge

ALL COMMUNICATIONS intended for the Editors should be sent to MR. FORDYCE. BOOKS for review should be sent to the Publisher

BOARD OF MANAGEMENT

PROF. R. G. AUSTIN, M.A.	Representing the Council of the Classical Association
F. H. SANDBACH, M.A. (<i>Hon. Sec.</i>)	
PROF. F. W. WALBANK, M.A.	
PROF. E. H. WARMINGTON, M.A. (<i>Hon. Treas.</i>)	

W. S. WATT, M.A.

N. G. L. HAMMOND, M.A., representing the Cambridge Philological Society

With the co-operation of

PROF. B. D. MERITT, Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton, PROF. J. A. FITZHERBERT, University of Adelaide, and
PROF. HOMER A. THOMPSON, University of Toronto

Volume LXIII

DECEMBER 1949

Numbers 3, 4

CONTENTS

ARISTOPHANES *THESMOPHORIAZUSAЕ* 855-7 AND EURIPIDES *HELENA* 1-3

A. Y. CAMPBELL	81
A PASSAGE IN <i>ION</i> OF CHIOS. J. D. BEAZLEY	83
THE SLEEP OF PHILOCTETES. D. M. JONES	83
HERODOTUS i. 94: <i>NOMIZEMA</i> . J. G. MILNE	85
THE AFTERMATH OF THE LAMIAN WAR. H. D. WESTLAKE	87
CORNELIUS NEPOS xxv. 18. 5. W. S. WATT	90
IN SUMMA. P. T. STEVENS	91
ZEUS SELEUKEIOS. P. FRASER	92
MARE PIGRUM ET GRAVE. A. R. BURN	94
A FRAGMENT OF MUSONIUS. G. D. KILPATRICK	94

REVIEWS:

The Style of Aeschylus (Barker), R. P. WINNINGTON-INGRAM, 95; *Euripides and Dionysus: An Interpretation of the Bacchae* (Winnington-Ingram), J. S. MORRISON, 96; *Political Interpretations in Greek Literature* (Webster), J. S. MORRISON, 98; *The Republica Lacedaemoniorum ascribed to Xenophon* (Chirimes), A. W. GOMME, 99; *The Politics of Aristotle* (Barker), H. D. P. LEE, 100; *Le Bonheur chez Aristote* (Léonard), D. A. REES, 102; *Horace, A Biography* (Sedgwick), T. E. WRIGHT, 103; *Tibullo Minore* (Pepe), *Le Roman de Sulpicia* (Bruguet), F. H. SANDBACH, 104; *Selections from Cicero, De Re Publica* (Poyer), A. H. McDONALD, 106; *Quintilian Institutions Oratoriae Liber XII* (Austin), S. F. BONNER, 108; *L. Annaei Senecae Divi Claudi Apocolocyntosis* (Russo), R. BROWNING, 109; *History of Ancient Geography* (Thomson), M. CARY, 111; *The Western Greeks* (Dunbabbin), R. M. COOK, 113; *La Vie privée des Doriens* (Déonna), W. A. LAIDLAW, 116; *Thalatta: Der Weg der Griechen zum Meer* (Lesky), H. D. WESTLAKE, 117; *Pericles and Athens* (Burn), A. J. HOLLADAY, 119; *The Calendars of Athens* (Prichett und Neugebauer), A. W. GOMME, 120; *Alexander the Great* (Tarn), A. H. M. JONES, 122; *Essays in Political Theory, presented to George H. Sabine* (Konvitz and Murphy), A. W. GOMME, 125; *The Stranger at the Gate* (Haarhoff), A. N. SHERWIN-WHITE, 126; *Egypt from Alexander the Great to the Arab Conquest* (Bell), E. G. TURNER, 127; *Trajan's Parthian War* (Lepper), A. H. M. JONES, 128; *Die Schweiz in römischer Zeit* (Stähelin), OLIVEN BROGAN, 130; *Greek Personality in Archaic Sculpture* (Karol), A. W. LAWRENCE, 131; *Greek Pottery* (Lane), T. B. L. WEBSTER, 132; *Greek Pleyty* (Nilsson), W. K. C. GUTHRIE, 133; *Niobe* (Kerényi), H. J. ROSE, 135; *Traditions of Civility* (Barker), J. F. LOCKWOOD, 136.

SHORT REVIEWS	137
SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS	145
BOOKS RECEIVED	148
INDEX	150

OXFORD : AT THE CLARENDON PRESS

LONDON, NEW YORK, TORONTO, AND MELBOURNE : GEOFFREY CUMBERLEGE

Price 10s. net. Yearly subscription, 16s. net, post free ; U.S.A., \$3.40. Combined yearly subscription for the
CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and the CLASSICAL REVIEW, 30s. net, post free ; U.S.A., \$6.30

Entered as Second Class at the New York, U.S.A., Post Office.

THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION

THE objects of the Classical Association are to promote the development and maintain the well-being of classical studies, and in particular (a) to impress upon public opinion the claim of such studies to an eminent place in the national scheme of education; (b) to improve the practice of classical teaching; (c) to encourage investigation and call attention to new discoveries; (d) to create opportunities for intercourse among lovers of classical learning.

Membership of the Association is open to men and women alike. The annual subscription is 5s. (life composition, £5. 5s.). Members receive a copy of the annual *Proceedings* of the Association and, on a payment of 6s., of *The Year's Work in Classical Studies* (both post free). They may also obtain the *Classical Review* and *Classical Quarterly* at reduced prices (*Review* 13s. 6d., *Quarterly* 15s.; combined subscription £1. 5s. 6d.), though the reduction cannot be guaranteed unless the subscription is paid before January 31st in each year. *Greece and Rome* may be obtained for an annual subscription of 10s. 6d.

Applications for membership should be addressed to the Hon. Treasurer, Mr. J. S. Shields, Queen Mary's School, Basingstoke, Hants. Inquiries should be sent to either of the Hon. Secretaries of the Association (Professor L. J. D. Richardson, University College, Cardiff, and Mr. T. W. Melhuish, Bec School, London, S.W. 17) or to the Hon. Secretary of any one of the District Branches—viz. Aberystwyth, Bedfordshire, Birmingham, Bristol, Cardiff, East Anglia, Hull, Kent, Leeds, Leicester, Liverpool, London, Manchester, Northumberland and Durham, North Wales, Nottingham, Oxford, Reading, Sheffield, Shrewsbury, Southampton, South-Western, Swansea, Taunton and West Somerset.

ain
on
on;
call
ers

ual
ual
in
and
ip-
ion
an

S.
er of
ity
on.
ng-
on,
ord,
and

FRO
ider
the
blan
wou
the
utte
ind
Pea
face
Eg
pur
whi
qui
con
Eg
ver
nee
agr
ran
it.
par
ave
inc
and
(19
tha
sol
tai

is
its
bu
ge
wa
ému
pro
me
to
(O
ov
th
th

THE CLASSICAL REVIEW

DECEMBER 1949

ARISTOPHANES THESMOPHORIAZUSAE 855-7 and EURIPIDES HELENA 1-3

857
*Νείλου μὲν αὖθε καλλιπάρθενοι ρώα,
ὅς ἀντὶ διας φακάδος Αἰγύπτου πέδον
λευκῆς νοτίζει μελανονύμων λεών.*

FROM *Νείλου* to *λευκῆς* the words are identical with our text of Eur. *Hel.* 1-3; the three which follow bear no resemblance to the four of the original. It would seem that *λευκῆς* is parody, and the sequel *παρὰ προσδοκίαν*. But what is utterly elusive is the point of the joke, indeed even the sense of the line. As Pearson (on Eur. l.c.) observes, we are faced with a contrast between 'white Egypt' and its "black (sun-burnt) and purge-taking" inhabitants; a contrast which it is 'not easy', indeed surely quite hopeless, to understand in this context (if indeed anywhere)—even if Egypt itself were not 'elsewhere proverbially *μελάμβαλος*'. In Euripides, it need hardly be added, *λευκῆς* does not agree with *Αἴγυπτον*; it agrees with *τακείσης χόνος*, the words which follow it. Another awkward feature is the apparent apposition of *πέδον* and *λεών*, to avoid which van Herwerden (and later independently von Velsen) proposed, and van Leeuwen and most recently (1928) Coulon accepted, *-μαίω λεώ*; of that we can hardly judge until we have solved the major difficulty, but it certainly seems an improvement.

Although the relevance of *-ουρμαῖον* is at present wholly to seek, the term itself is not only clear in its implications but presumably helpful as a clue to the general puzzle. The purging was by way of régime, Hdt. ii. 77. 2-3; cf. *ἐμετικὴν agebat*, Cic. Att. xiii. 52. 1. The preoccupation of the Egyptians with medicine is a Greek joke that goes back to Homer; 'everybody is a doctor there' (*Od.* iv. 231). Partly because of their *ουρμαῖομός*, but perhaps still more through the equability of their climate, they were the healthiest of peoples after the Libyans (Hdt., l.c.).

On the other hand, although Herodotus does not mention it, there was one malady, a major malady and in medieval times the scourge of Europe, to which the Egyptians were peculiarly (and are still) exposed. *Lucr.* vi. 1114 f. 'est elephas morbus qui propter flumina Nili | gignitur Aegypto in media neque praeterea usquam'; *Pliny* xxvi. 1. 5, § 8, on 'elephantiasis': '*Aegypti peculiare* hoc malum'. Elephantiasis is a form of leprosy.¹ *Enc. Brit.*, ed. II, xvi, p. 479, identifies leprosy with 'elephantiasis Graecorum', and states (p. 480) that prescriptions for treating it have been found in Egypt dating from as far back as 4600 B.C. The Greeks in general may not always have distinguished much² between the two very closely associated diseases which they called *λέπρα* and *λεύκη*, (cf. *Hdt.* i. 138, *Hippocr. Prorrh.* ii. 43); at all events L.S.J. describe the latter as 'a kind of leprosy or elephantiasis'.³

These things being so, it is surely an effective remedy—as it is obviously a minimum change—to read *λεύκη νοτίζει*. As for the awkwardness of the double accusative (for I cannot think that the shift from quotation to travesty could excuse an apposition so harsh as that of 'people' with 'soil'), it would seem better, for two reasons, not to alter *πέδον* to *πέδον*, and for my part I am completely satisfied with Herwerden's dative. In place of heaven-sent rain they have their blessed Nile—to infect the soil of Egypt with a white plague for

¹ θεφαντίας: εἶδος λέπρας, *Hesych.* The distinction seems to have been lost. *λέπρα* (*σημαίνει τὸν θεφαντιασμόν*), *E.M.* 561. 4, s.v. *λεπρός*.

² Cf. n. 1.

³ Cf. *ἀλφος*. The old English for leprosy is *bleace*; cf. *O.E.D.* s.v. 'bleach' (sb.). For more specific modern identifications of *λέπρα*, *θεφή*, *φάρα*, *ἀλφος*, and (in Celsus) *leuce*, see W. G. Spenser's notes to the Loeb *Celsus* (1935-8), vol. i, p. 342, vol. ii, pp. 166 and 172.

its *black* and regimen-loving folk'. Here we have sense, and fact, and point too, for *-συρμαῖν* answers to *νοοῖει* as *μελανο-* to *λεύκη*; cf. above, last sentence of second paragraph.

λεύκη, a methodical deduction as just explained, itself of course suggested the change of *νοοῖει* to *νοοῖει*, which verb was for me a pure guess. On consulting L.S.J. I learned that this is extant only in Ar. *Probl.* 859^a15; but on turning to that treatise I found that for our context *νοοῖει* would appear to be a peculiarly appropriate word, owing partly (i) to its occurrence in this treatise, but also (ii) to its occurrence in these initial paragraphs of the treatise. For (i) the *Problemata* is one of the few (five) works which mention (each once) the disease by this its rarer name; *λεύκη* is discussed in 891^a26 to b₃. (ii) Only ten lines below we have a reference to the regular use of *ἔμετοι* (cf. our *-συρμαῖν*). True, that is in the following 'problem'; but (a) all this shows that my restored line is happily *consistent* in its scientific terminology and colouring; (b) the 'problem' is *διὰ τί ἐν ταῖς μεταβολαῖς τῶν ὥρῶν ἔμέτοις οὐ δεῖ χρῆσθαι*;—a question which surely has an obvious connexion with Hdt. ii. 77. 2-3 cited above, since it implies precisely the same relation between *συρμαῖσμός* and (Hdt.'s own words) *αἱ μεταβολαὶ . . . τῶν ὥρέων*; now is not this another sign that we have before us just the *sort* of work from which Aristophanes would get the two technical words which I have restored *as well as* the one which is there already? The medical part of the *Problemata* is in any case of Hippocratic origin;¹ and *συρμαῖσμός*, a practice to which there are three² references in the remains of Aristophanes, occurs first in the Hippocratic corpus (*Art.* 40). The comedian is making a sudden shift from the diction of tragedy to the nomenclature of science, which for him was comic.

I now proceed to a completely independent consideration of the other passage.

¹ W. D. Ross, *Aristotle*, p. 13.

² The others are *Pax* 1254, *fr.* 265.

II

Eur. *Hel.* 1-3, first two lines as above, then *λευκῆς τακείσης χώρος ὑγρανεῖ γύας*. This sentence has naturally been the object of critical experiment. One difficulty, at least, is manifest: *γύας* is required by the syntax to be in apposition to *Αἰγύπτου πέδον*, but (a) logic and (b) Greek alike forbid. For (a) apposition is not truism; the single term here adds nothing, the soil of Egypt is no more and no less *γύας* than virtually any other soil. And (b) no bare substantive ever stands thus in apposition; it must be qualified by the article unless it is qualified by something else. Both these defects entirely vanish with Naber's *λευροῦς* for *λευκῆς*; but the parody clearly forbids any such change of epithet; moreover, this proposal fails to remove, perhaps even accentuates, a separate difficulty which is as material as any. 'Snow', whether white or not, 'having been melted' may profess to be an explanation of the flooding, but is actually no explanation at all; what snow? where? why? The genitive absolute is not good enough; no connexion is established.³ This difficulty, in its turn, is likewise completely removed by Reiske's *ροᾶς* for *γύας*; but then this word clashes hopelessly with *ροᾶι* as last word of line 1; it is not merely a harsh iteration, it is also a false relation. That would be avoided if we could adopt Murray's transposition, reading in 1 *οὖτε . . . γύας* so as to facilitate *ροᾶς* in 3. But this we certainly cannot do. *ροᾶι* in 1 is confirmed by evidence from different quarters of overwhelming unanimity; by Ar. *Thesm.* 855, which quotes it the very next year, while the play was topical; by *fr.* 228. 3, *ροᾶς*, sc. *Νεῖλον*, with similar context (*ταχῆ χώρων κτλ.*); by *Bacch.* 519 f., *H.F.* 784-7; and, in my opinion, by the fact that the same word ends the first line of another Euripidean play, the *Electra*.⁴ So we are back where we were before.

³ Contrast the presentation of the same explanation in *fr.* 228. 3 f.

⁴ Where, incidentally, I suspect the true reading to be *οὐ γῆς παλαιὸς ἀρδμός*, 'Ινάχου *ροᾶι*'. And this would make another point of comparison. Cf. Aesch. *Pers.* 806.

I h
there
mere.
λευκή
atten
Harr.
bears
elsew
mote
regar
pian
recor
ding
duplici

ION C

τόδε σ
δοκέον
στόματ
λέγων
οἱ ζωγ
χειρον

Sch
culty
expect
well

χρυ
κών
ζωγρά

W
Apol
haire

¹ R
p. 15;
von C
Ameri

WHE
Hyp
why
quest
the s
vide
454 i
fectio
Hepl
but n

¹ II

I have mentioned two difficulties, but there is a third. *λευκῆς* is not insipid merely; it is positively silly. In the *λευκῆς χύνος* of *Ba.* 662—to which my attention was fortunately drawn by Mr. Harrison—the epithet is picturesque, it bears out *εὐλόγεις* (or *έξαργεις*); and so elsewhere in E.; here, however, the remoteness (in place, or time, as you regard it) of the unmelted snow (Aethiopian by this account, as E. elsewhere records) makes it the wretchedest padding; and it is absent from this phrase's duplicate in *fr.* 228. 4.

I can see one way, and only one, of satisfying the requirements, and that is to adopt the correction casually thrown out by Tucker in *Proc. Camb. Philol. Soc.* xvi. 3, *λευκῆ . . . χύσει*. He cites nothing; but cf. *H.F.* 573 *Δίρκης νάρα λευκόν* (similar in diction is *νασμῶ μελανηγεῖ* of blood, *Hec.* 153) and *Call. hymn.* i. 18 *λευκότατος ποταμῶν*.

In both passages there are very obvious, but totally different, reasons why *λευκῆ* should have been corrupted to *λευκῆς*. A. Y. CAMPBELL.

University of Liverpool.

A PASSAGE IN ION OF CHIOS

Ion of Chios in Athenaeus xiii. 604 a-b:

ἀγνελάσας ἐπὶ τῷ Ἐρετριεῖ Σοφοκλῆς· οὐδὲ τόδε σοι ἀρέσκει ἄρα, ὃ ξένε, τὸ Σιμωνίδειον, κάρτα δοκὸν τοῖς "Ἐλδοῖς εὖ εἰρήσας"· πορφυρὸν ἀπὸ σύμματος λείσα φανὰν παρθένον· οὐδὲ ὁ ποιητής, ἔφη, λέγων χριστοκόμαν Ἀπόλλωνα· χρυσέας γάρ εἰ ἐποίησεν ὁ ζωγράφος τὰς τοῦ θεοῦ κόμας καὶ μὴ μελαίνας, χείρον ἂν ἦν τὸ ζωγράφημα.¹

Scholars do not seem to find any difficulty in *μελαίνας*, but surely one would expect *ξανθάς*, and perhaps it would be well to read

χρυσέας γάρ εἰ ἐποίησεν ὁ ζωγράφος τὰς τοῦ θεοῦ κόμας καὶ μὴ *ξανθάς* η μελαίνας, χείρον ἂν ἦν τὸ ζωγράφημα.

Why is black mentioned at all, since Apollo is regularly thought of as fair-haired? Sophocles is arguing as he

believes the schoolmaster would argue. *χρύσεον*, the schoolmaster would say, is an unnatural colour for hair; *ξανθόν* and *μέλαν* are natural colours. Black hair might not be appropriate to Apollo: but black would be a natural colour for hair, and the schoolmaster's criterion is naturalness. Paint it fair, paint it black: only not golden.

As a matter of fact Apollo is often given black hair by vase-painters, even in elaborate works like the Tityos cup in Munich or the Niobid krater in the Louvre. It hardly follows that the vase-painters thought of Apollo as black-haired; but in the limited technique of red-figure the normal recipe for all hair is 'black', and 'yellow' is exceptional. I do not remember an example of a dark-haired Apollo where an artist is working with a full palette.

J. D. BEAZLEY.

Oxford.

THE SLEEP OF PHILOCTETES

WHEN Hera went seeking the help of Hypnos for her plan to deceive Zeus, why did she find him in Lemnos?¹ The question is a long-standing puzzle, and the scholia which try to answer it provide some entertainment. The Venetus 454 is interested chiefly in Hypnos' affection for Pasithea, the sister-in-law of Hephaestus who was lord of the island, but mentions as an alternative explana-

tion the wine-producing quality of the island and the probable drunkenness of the inhabitants. The Venetus 453 offers only this second explanation, which it develops with further evidence. The Townleianus agrees with Ven. 453 in the importance it attaches to this explanation, but it mentions also Pasithea and offers two other suggestions—the last, that Hypnos' presence in Lemnos was accidental, and the last but one,

¹ *Il.* xiv. 230-1.

that it was in answer to the appeals of Philoctetes: *οἱ δὲ ὅτι Φιλοκτῆτης ἔδειροντο εἶναι ἐκεὶ διὰ τὰς ὁδύνας.* In spite of the inaccuracy of making Philoctetes, not the Chorus, call on Hypnos,¹ there can hardly be no reference to the famous lyric of Sophocles, *Phil.* 827 ff., of which the words *διὰ τὰς ὁδύνας* are an obvious echo.

As an explanation of the Homeric passage the scholium is useless, but it does not follow that there is no relation between the passages of the *Iliad* and the *Philoctetes*. Mythological references in Attic tragedy are not infrequently many-sided in their relevance; beyond their immediate appropriateness to the context there is often an implicit reference which enhances their significance. For example, in *Phil.* 391 ff. the Chorus hails *ὅρεστέρα παμβῶτι Γᾶ* and refers especially, as the context requires, to her presence in Asia. But it cannot be irrelevant that there was in Lemnos the cult of a similar goddess, *μεγάλη θέος*.² With the Homeric passage in mind, we may reasonably ask whether something of the sort may not be found in connexion with the invocation of Hypnos. It would be most satisfactory, no doubt, if some circumstance outside both the *Iliad* and the *Philoctetes* were discovered to provide a background for both passages at once. Was Hypnos perhaps traditionally involved in the legend of Philoctetes? There is no evidence that he was, and had such a tradition been preserved, say in the *Little Iliad*, it surely could not have eluded Alexandrian scholarship, and there would have been no need for the hypotheses recorded in our scholia. For a similar reason must be doubted the tentative suggestion of some scholars³ that there may have been a cult of Hypnos in Lemnos. Even if the Homeric passage were sufficient evidence for the existence of such a cult, it could not have survived into the fifth century with

sufficient prominence to account for the Sophoclean passage and at the same time have remained unknown to the Homeric scholarship of Alexandria. Moreover, cults of Hypnos were usually not independent but associated with those of deities to whom he was an accessory, especially the divinities of health and healing. Such a connexion does not correspond to his character in Homer, and in any case does not lead to Lemnos.

There remains the possibility that the Sophoclean passage echoes the Homeric; that the presence of Hypnos in Lemnos in a celebrated passage of the *Iliad* was sufficient by itself to establish him there, and that the coincidence of the two passages would not have escaped the better-educated members of Sophocles' audience, even if they were not all so learned in Homer as the Niceratus of Xenophon's *Symposium*. As in the case of Ge, so in that of Hypnos, there is an implicit local connexion. In the former case there is a sort of tension between the explicitly Asiatic character of the goddess and the unmentioned association with Lemnos—a tension which can be felt especially in the *κάκεῖ*—‘there too (as here)’ of 395. In the case of Hypnos also there is a tension which is increased by the implicit reference. The Chorus summons Hypnos in his character of liberator from pain and care, bringer of healing, but its unspoken object is the stealing of the bow, and Hypnos is to assist.⁴ Whoever recalls Hypnos' earlier literary connexion with Lemnos must remember that it was for a similar purpose that Hera sought him there, as on that still earlier occasion when he had helped her to work her ill will on Heracles (*Il.* xiv. 249–62).⁵

¹ Cf. Reinhardt, *Sophokles*, p. 192: ‘... das leise, sogenannte “Schlaflied”, das in Wahrheit aber trotz der sanften Anrufe des Hypnos, alles andere als ein Schlaflied ist, vielmehr ein Lied der leisen, aber umso stärkeren Verführung zum Verrat.’

² In *Il.* xiv. 231 Hypnos has his common appellation ‘brother of Thanatos’. Are there echoes of this too in and near the lyric? 797–8 have been mentioned; in 819–22 Philoctetes begs the earth to receive him in death, but Neoptolemus observes that it is sleep which is coming upon him. In 861, in the epode of the lyric, the Chorus describes Philoctetes in the words *τις ὡς Μῆδα πάρα κείμενος*.

¹ It is Hypnos' brother Thanatos whom he is wont to summon (Soph. *Phil.* 797–8).

² Cf. Campbell, ad loc.; Hesych.; Phot. s.v. *μεγάλη θέος*; Steph. Byz. s.v. *Ἄγνωστος*.

³ Leaf ad *Il.* xiv. 230; Gruppe, *Griech. Mythologie*, ii. 929, n. 3.

It has been suggested that the model for the Homeric Deception of Zeus was an earlier Deception of which the summary appears to be preserved in the narration of Hypnos (*Il.* xiv. 249-62), and that the presence of the god in Lemnos, unexplained in the *Iliad*, was somehow connected with the earlier poem.¹ In any case, through the medium of the Homeric episode and the localization in Lemnos, there is brought to mind one connexion of Hypnos with the Heracles legend—not the only one, if he had a part in helping Heracles and Telamon to kill Alcyoneus.² On the one occasion he acted against Heracles, on the other for him, but on both he was present in his character of the deceiver. It is no new observation that Sophocles insists on the likeness of Philoctetes to Heracles, of whom he inherits not only the bow but in a way the suffering, and that together with hatred for the Atreidae reverence for Heracles is the chief influence in Philoctetes' mind. The sleep of Philoctetes recalls Heracles not only through the indirect route of the connexion of Hypnos with the legend of Heracles, but more directly because Sophocles in several places imitates his

own sleeping Heracles of the *Trachiniae*—in the similarity of Philoctetes' affliction to his (cf. *Trach.* 980-1, 1010), the similar appeal for death (cf. *Trach.* 1004-6, 1040-2), the similar warning not to wake the sufferer (cf. *Trach.* 974-82, 988-91). By such reminiscent touches is built up the importance of Heracles as an ideal in Philoctetes' mind and as a power behind the action of the play, while preparation is made for his epiphany at the end.

These threads, fine-spun though they may be, seem to connect the sleep of Philoctetes with other passages of literature from which it receives an intensification of its meaning and its importance to the plot. Hypnos is invoked as the god who brings release from pain, but implicit is that other aspect in which he had appeared before and especially in Lemnos itself—the god who makes men helpless (cf. *Phil.* 855-61) and delivers them to their betrayers, who is not far removed from death itself. In both his characters Hypnos had associations with Heracles; as the deceiver he appears in the Heracles legend, as the releaser from pain (though not here represented as a god) in Sophocles' own *Trachinia*.

D. M. JONES.

Birkbeck College, London.

HERODOTUS i. 94: *NOMIΣEMA*

(Λυδοί) . . πρῶτοι ἀνθρώπων τῶν ἡμεῖς οἵμεν νόμισμα χρυσοῦ καὶ ἀργύρου κοψάμενοι ἔχρισαντο, πρῶτοι δὲ καὶ κάπηλοι ἐγένοντο (Herodotus i. 94. 1).

THE statement of Herodotus concerning the reforms in currency initiated by the Lydians has been so frequently misinterpreted by writers on numismatics, to the confusion of historians, that it seems desirable to re-examine it. The most literal translation is '(The Lydians) first of men, to our knowledge, struck and circulated specie of gold and silver, and were the first commercial travellers'. This does not mean, as used to be supposed, that Herodotus attributed to the Lydians the origin of striking metal coins; and even after J. P. Six had pointed out that his words obviously referred to a dual coinage of gold and

silver—i.e. a bimetallic currency—the earliest known instance of which could be traced to Croesus, the full significance of the statement was not appreciated.

The root of the error lies in the mis-translation of the word *νόμισμα*. The meaning of this term is exactly defined by Aristotle (*Eth.* v. 1133^a28 ff.). The nomisma was a medium of exchange of agreed value, and got its name from the fact of this agreement: it was not valued as bullion—φύσει—but as specie—νόμισμα—and could be devalued accordingly: bullion has a competitive, not an agreed, value. It was not necessarily coined, even in historic Greece: the earliest known examples of Greek nomismata are the bundles of iron spits from which

the drachma got its name and use as a measure of value: these were superseded in most of the Peloponnesus by Pheidon's translation of the silver stater of the Aeginetan merchants into a nomisma, but they continued in use at Sparta, outside the range of his influence, until much later: Plutarch (*Lysander* 17) implies that *vóμισματα τοῦντα* in the form of ὀβελικοί were still current there at the end of the fifth century, and there is no trace of any local silver coinage in Laconia for over a century after that date: a very few early Aeginetan coins have been found there, but they are probably strays. Elsewhere in the Greek trade-world nomismata of leather are recorded: in Assyria Sargon issued half-shekels of lead: clay tokens are found at Palmyra and in Mesopotamia. To-day most of the civilized world is content with nomismata of paper.

Nomismata, then, existed long before the rise of the Lydian kingdom, and some of them may have been struck, though other forms would more probably be cast, and others were natural objects, or manufactured articles such as the Greek spits. If the Lydian bimetallic coinage is rightly attributed to the reign of Croesus, it was antedated in Greece by about a century, when Pheidon, as already noted, adopted the Aeginetan bullion stater as a nomisma and got coins struck for him at Aegina. His coins have not been definitely identified, but may well belong to one of the numerous anonymous series that are generally known as Island coins and are assigned to the seventh-century mint of Aegina. These are of silver: no early gold nomismata can be identified, as it is not likely that the late Minoan or Mycenaean gold dumps or rings were used as specie, though in the absence of contemporary records that can be interpreted no conclusion can be reached: it is practically certain that the Ionian pale gold coins earlier than Croesus passed at bullion values, as their successors unquestionably did in the fifth and fourth centuries. There is no bimetallic coinage of gold and silver at related values known to us now (or,

according to his own statement, to Herodotus) prior to that which is attributed to Croesus.

The object of this coinage can be deduced from the fact that the gold was struck with the same types in two weights: there was a heavy gold unit of about 168 grains and a light one of about 126, while the silver was of one weight only, the heavier. The relative value of gold and silver in the Persian Empire, about a century later, is given by Herodotus as 13 to 1: if the Lydian was approximately the same, with a slight appreciation of gold, one light gold unit would equal ten silver as nomismata in the kingdom of Croesus. But the relative values would not be the same elsewhere: in Greece the equation of gold to silver in the fifth century B.C. was 10 to 1, in Egypt it might be as low as 2 to 1. So it was more convenient for the Greek traders, who would take the Lydian gold and silver as bullion, to have them made up on the same basis: in Greece, if the ratios were the same as a century later, the heavy gold coins would be reckoned as the equivalents of ten silver; and as silver was the standard metal for Greek currency it was simpler to make the Lydian silver coinage the unit for comparison with the Greek and to have the Lydian gold unit of the same weight as the silver one. It seems clear that the new scheme was devised by Croesus (or his advisers) to encourage trade with Greece: his predecessors had struck coins of the local pale gold, which could be used for foreign trade as bullion conveniently, being struck on a fairly exact scheme of weights; but that the coins were regarded as bullion is shown by the fact that they are frequently found punch-marked in the same manner as several series of Greek coins of a later date: this marking was intended to indicate that the coins were to be valued φύσει, not νόμῳ, and was applied in cases where the coins had lost the guarantee of value given them by their original issuers—for instances see the Aeginetan silver after the conquest of Aegina by Athens, the Persian silver sigloi after the victories of Alexander, the tetra-

drachma
Egypt
standard
The
seen
point
that
ting
xpws
data
which
specie
cons
either
meta
dedic
the
sam
merci
scrib
relat
be o
Cro
of g
serv
curr

T
Croc
sian
link
gold
only
betw
throu
on t
Cyz

TH
ope
is a
38).
and
Aet
saly
The
Mac
lian
inv
Pol
Mac

A
un

drachms of Ptolemy I and II after Egypt had gone over to a copper standard in the middle of the third century. The dedications of Croesus at Delphi seen and described by Herodotus are pointers in the same direction: he states that there were two sets of blocks, distinguished as being respectively ἀπέρθεντο χρυσοῦ and λευκοῦ χρυσοῦ, and gives details of the weights of the blocks which are virtually particulars of their specific gravity and show the metal constituent. There is no obvious reason, either artistic or religious, why the two metals should have been mixed in the dedication: it is much more likely that the blocks were intended to serve as sample exhibits at an important Greek mercantile centre of exchange, and inscribed with information such as that relating to their weights which might be of commercial interest. The gift of Croesus to the Delphians of two staters of gold for each man might similarly serve as an introduction of his new currency.

The bimetallic coinage system of Croesus was not continued by the Persians, who did not seek an economic link with the Greeks: they struck both gold and silver, but on one standard only, that of gold; and the exchange between Asia and Europe was effected through the medium of the Greek cities on the west coast of Asia Minor, mainly Cyzicus, Phocaea, and Mytilene: these

issued staters and fractions of pale gold, known in trade as Cyzicenes or Phocaics. That was all the denomination they received, and their value in terms of Greek silver varied from place to place. If the Greeks wanted to buy the Persian refined gold in quantity, they had to buy it at the Persian exchange rate: for instance, for the statue of the Parthenos the Athenians had to pay silver for gold at 14 to 1, slightly above the normal Persian rate, and 40 per cent. above the Greek. The Persians must have made handsome profits out of the gold trade with Greece until Philip II reversed the current and immobilized the Great King's reserve of gold by flooding the market with an issue at a cheaper rate.

Croesus may have failed in his object: but at any rate he deserves credit for having attempted a solution of the problem of exchange between two currencies based on different metal standards, which seems to baffle politicians on both sides of the Atlantic to-day. And Herodotus also deserves credit for his appreciation of the economic ground for the action of Croesus, which, if we may judge from the speech of Demosthenes against Phormio, was beyond the comprehension of the members of an Athenian jury, if not of Demosthenes himself, in the next century.

J. G. MILNE.

Corpus Christi College, Oxford.

THE AFTERMATH OF THE LAMIAN WAR

THE only surviving record of the military operations in northern Greece in 321 B.C. is a bleak summary by Diodorus (xviii. 38). He describes how after Antipater and Craterus had crossed to Asia the Aetolians made an expedition to Thessaly, where they persuaded most of the Thessalians to join them against the Macedonians; when, however, the Aetolians withdrew to repel an Acarnanian invasion, their allies were crushed by Polyperchon, the deputy governor of Macedonia.

A remarkable feature of an otherwise unremarkable narrative is the size of the Greek forces assembled in Thessaly.

The Aetolians brought 12,000 infantry and 400 cavalry, and before their withdrawal the confederate army amounted to 25,000 infantry and 1,500 cavalry (38. 1-3).¹ In each case the infantry figure is surprisingly high. There is no evidence that the Aetolians ever dispatched an expeditionary force exceeding 12,000, even after they had greatly enlarged their territory by absorbing neighbouring districts.² At the beginning of

¹ References are to Diodorus xviii unless otherwise stated.

² Beloch, *Bevölkerung der griech.-röm. Welt*, pp. 187-8, and *Griech. Gesch.* iv. 1. 353. The Aetolian army sent to stem the Gallic invasion of 279, a

the Lamian war they had sent 7,000 to Thermopylae (9. 5) and after its conclusion had mobilized only 10,000 to defend their country against invasion (24. 2); these figures are consistent with one another in view of the practice of limiting expeditionary armies to approximately two-thirds of the strength available for home defence. How, then, can they have sent 12,000 to Thessaly in 321? The figure must either be an exaggeration¹ or include troops other than Aetolian levies. Similarly there are strong reasons for disbelieving the implication that the Thessalians contributed 13,000 infantry, though small contingents from Achaea, Phthiotis, and the Spercheius basin are probably included. Firstly, the infantry supplied by the Thessalians in the Lamian war fell far below this total,² and the failures under Athenian leadership in 322 can scarcely have encouraged widespread confidence in a similar venture under the Aetolians in 321. The reduction of the Thessalian cavalry from 2,000 in the Lamian war (15. 2) to 1,100 in 321, though even the former figure does not represent the total cavalry strength of the district,³ suggests that the punitive

crisis of exceptional gravity, possibly exceeded 12,000 (the text of Paus. x. 20. 4 is defective), but there is no adequate reason for believing that it did (Tarn, *C.A.H.* vii. 102. Flacelière, *Les Aitoliens à Delphes*, p. 96, n. 1, is unconvincing).

¹ Schwahn, *Heeresmatrikel und Landfriede Philipps*, p. 8, rejects it as false.

² The Greeks had 22,000 infantry against Leonnatus (15. 2) and 25,000 at Crannon (17. 2). Of these at least 10,000 were mercenaries and 5,000 Athenians (9. 1, 11. 3), so that the contributions of Thessaly, Phocis, and other northern districts must have been modest.

³ I have maintained elsewhere that in the Lamian war Thessalian support for the Greek cause was by no means unanimous (*Thessaly in the Fourth Century B.C.*, p. 231). Some additional points may be noted here. Diodorus (11. 1-2) and Pausanias (i. 25. 4) give impressive lists of allies, but the figures given in n. 2 above show that many supplied little or no military aid. To encourage wavers the Athenians evidently counted as allies all states not controlled by Macedonian garrisons or not expressly hostile to Athenian diplomatic missions. The statement that all Thessaly except Pelinna joined the alliance (11. 1) seems to mean only that Pelinna was garrisoned by the Macedonians. The insurrection was probably confined to Pharsalus, Pherae, and the south: that Larissa,

measures of Antipater had induced a greater reluctance on the part of the dominant aristocracy to challenge Macedonian authority.⁴ Secondly, a ratio of almost twelve infantrymen to each cavalryman is suspiciously high in an army predominantly Thessalian. When making this point some years ago I could only suggest that some mistake by Diodorus had led him to exaggerate the size of the Greek forces, both Aetolian and Thessalian.⁵ It cannot be said that long familiarity with Diodorus breeds confidence in his accuracy, but in this section of his work the army-totals, which are more abundant than elsewhere, are strikingly consistent with each other and give the impression of being unusually reliable. I now believe that his figures for the Aetolian expeditionary army and the confederate troops assembled in Thessaly are accurate but that through drastic compression of his source he has omitted an important feature of their composition, namely, the inclusion of large mercenary forces consisting principally of men who had served in the Lamian war.

At least 10,000 mercenaries were recruited for service against Antipater in 323,⁶ and as battle casualties were remarkably light,⁷ almost all must have survived the disintegration of the allied army in the following year. They can-

which was in a dangerously exposed situation, contributed to the allied army is unlikely. The number of cavalry (5,000) on the Macedonian side at Crannon (16. 5) exceeds the separate figures for the cavalry forces of Antipater, Leonnatus, and Craterus (3,600 in aggregate, 12. 2, 14. 5, 16. 4) despite casualties in earlier battles. Diodorus may have omitted to mention the arrival of some cavalry reinforcements, but it is not improbable that some Thessalians remained loyal to Antipater and fought against their compatriots.

⁴ Cf. Θετταλοί πάντες πλὴν Πελινναῶν (11. 1) with τὸν πλεόνους τῶν Θετταλῶν ἐπιστρατεύειν (38. 3), both statements being exaggerated through the influence of contemporary propaganda.

⁵ Op. cit., p. 234, n. 2; cf. the army of Jason discussed *ibid.*, pp. 104-12.

⁶ 8,000 under Leosthenes (9. 1), 2,000 sent with the Athenian citizen army (11. 3), and perhaps a few more contributed by allied states.

⁷ The Greek losses at Crannon were only 500 (17. 5, cf. Plut. *Phoc.* 26. 1), while the battle against Leonnatus was almost exclusively a cavalry engagement (15. 3-4).

not have deserted to the enemy in large numbers at Crannon: the Greek defeat was not a rout, and the generals debated whether to await reinforcements and then engage the Macedonians again (17. 6). Moreover, most of the mercenaries had returned to Greece in defiance of Alexander's orders¹ and could expect to be treated as deserters. They were doubtless withdrawn from Thessaly with the Athenian citizen troops,² but they must have been discharged as soon as Athens came to terms with Antipater. What became of them subsequently is not recorded. While many may eventually have found their way back to Asia,³ there can be little doubt that most returned for a time to the recruiting depot at Taenarum, which was conveniently remote and almost impregnable.⁴ Antipater did not penetrate far into the Peloponnese, and these men are likely to have remained undisturbed at Taenarum throughout the winter awaiting further employment.⁵ An opportunity seems to have been offered to them in the following year.

Neither the Aetolians nor the Thessalians could maintain large bodies of mercenaries at this time, but in the first sentence of his account Diodorus provides a clue to the identity of their paymaster (38. 1). He states that the Aetolians κατὰ τὰς πρὸς Περδίκκαν συνθήκας ἐστράτευσαν εἰς τὴν Θετταλίαν, ἀντιπερισπάσαι βουλόμενοι τὸν Ἀντίπατρον.⁶ The wish to divert Antipater should evidently be attributed not to the Aetolians, whose aim to safeguard their independence was indeed furthered

¹ Diod. xvii. 111. 1-2, and xviii. 9. 1; Paus. i. 25. 5, and viii. 52. 5.

² Thessalian towns besieged by the Macedonians received no aid (17. 7).

³ Griffith, *Mercenaries of the Hellenistic Age*, p. 36.

⁴ Griffith, op. cit., pp. 259-60.

⁵ That any were among the 2,500 enlisted by agents of Thibron for service at Cyrene (21. 1-2) seems to be excluded on chronological grounds: these men almost certainly left Taenarum before the end of the Lamian war.

⁶ The alliance with Perdiccas has not been mentioned before (and is not mentioned again); the use of the definite article suggests that Diodorus has omitted details about its formation given earlier by his source.

by his absence, but to Perdiccas, who instigated the Aetolian offensive to relieve the pressure upon himself. Hitherto he had supported the efforts of Antipater to suppress Greek refractoriness;⁷ now it might be turned to his own advantage. He could scarcely hope to induce the Athenians, now watched by a Macedonian garrison, to take up arms so soon after the surrender of the previous year, though he did correspond with Demades. The Aetolians, however, had narrowly survived the invasion of Antipater and Craterus, who are credited with the intention of transferring the entire population to a remote part of Asia (25. 5), and he could rely on them to support him energetically in their own interest. Whether their military strength, combined with that of such allies as might join them, would prove equal to the task of creating an effective diversion must have appeared more questionable. He could not send any troops from Asia because he needed every man for his own operations and those of Eumenes, but his financial resources were immense, and if he were to reinforce the diversion in Greece by enlisting a large body of mercenaries, Antipater might be compelled to return from Asia to protect Macedonia.⁸

Another sentence of Diodorus supports the view that the forces operating in Thessaly were not confined to Aetolian and Thessalian levies. On learning that the Acarnanians were plundering their country the Aetolians τὸν μὲν ἄλλος στρατώτας ἀπέλιπον ἐν Θετταλίᾳ, Μένωνα τὸν Φαρσάλιον ἐπιστήσαντες στρατηγόν, αὐτὸι δὲ τοὺς πολιτικοὺς ἀναλαβόντες ἥκον συντόμως εἰς τὴν Αιτωλίαν (38. 5). The wording is unnatural, for the Aetolians certainly cannot have contemplated transferring Thessalians to Aetolia to assist them against the

⁷ De Sanctis, *Problemi di Storia antica*, p. 142.

⁸ Diversionary action to distract an enemy from the main theatre of war became a feature of the struggles between the Successors. It was much used by Antigonus: his alliance with the Aetolians in 315 was part of such a diversion directed against Cassander, but, unlike Perdiccas in 321, he had prospects of gaining more powerful allies. He sent to Greece a diplomatic agent, who enlisted 8,000 mercenaries, probably at Taenarum.

invaders; it suggests that Diodorus has paraphrased with his habitual clumsiness a narrative in which the composite nature of the confederate army had already been explained. From *τοὺς ἄλλους στρατιώτας* (not *τοὺς Θετταλούς*) and *τοὺς πολιτικούς ἀναλαβόντες* it may be inferred that the forces remaining in Thessaly included troops who were not Thessalians and that the Aetolians had brought with them some (whether allies or mercenaries)¹ who were not Aetolians and were not withdrawn.

In 323 mercenaries from the Peloponnese had been concentrated in northern Greece without difficulty, and there were no serious obstacles in 321. Some units seem to have been moved to Aetolia, like those of Leosthenes in 323 (9. 4-5), before the campaign began, while a somewhat larger body was probably sent direct to Thessaly. Meno of Pharsalus, whose desertion of Antipater in the Lamian war must have been regarded as treason against the Thessalian League, had doubtless been an exile since its conclusion and may have played a prominent part in organizing the campaign of 321. He had connexions

¹ *οἱ πολιτικοὶ* can be used as the opposite of *οἱ σύμμαχοι* or of *οἱ ἔλεος*, but it is significant that in describing the armies of the Lamian war Diodorus (11. 3) contrasts *πολιτικὸς μὲν* with *μισθοφόρος δὲ* and Hyperides (vi. 11) *ξενικὴ μὲν δύναμις* with *τῆς δὲ πολιτικῆς* (cf. the observations of Tarn, *Alexander*, ii. 169, n. 2 on 12. 2; also Dem. xviii. 237).

outside Thessaly² and may well have provided the link between the Aetolians, Perdiccas, and the mercenaries.

How Polyperchon overwhelmed the insurgents is not recorded. Although his army is said to have been a large one (38. 6), his Macedonians can scarcely have outnumbered their opponents, for Antipater and Craterus had taken some 30,000 to Asia. Support from Thessalians loyal to Macedonia and lack of cohesion among the enemy may well have lightened his task. A decisive factor, however, was evidently the withdrawal of the Aetolians: if, as seems probable, the Acarnanian invasion of Aetolia was instigated by him, he found in this counter-diversion a most effective answer to the diversion of Perdiccas.³

H. D. WESTLAKE.

University of Manchester.

² His daughter married Aeacides of Epirus and became the mother of Pyrrhus (Plut. *Pyrrh.* 1. 6-7).

³ If more were known about the *Carthaginian* of Menander and its relation to the *Poenulus* of Plautus, which has Aetolia for its setting, some light might have been thrown upon the episode discussed above. Webster, *Rylands Bulletin*, xxx (1947), p. 54, gives reasons for believing the *Carthaginian* to have been an early play and suggests that the choice of scene may have been determined by contemporary history. After 317, when Demetrius of Phalerum, the friend of Menander, became governor of Athens for Cassander, the Aetolians cannot have been in favour there, but during the preceding years many Athenians who, like Demades, hoped to turn the conflicts of the Successors to account doubtless felt sympathetic towards Aetolia.

CORNELIUS NEPOS xxv. 18. 5

attigit (*sc. Atticus*) quoque poetiken, credimus,
ne eius expers esset suavitatis.

So the manuscripts, and most editors; Fleckeisen's transposition of *quoque* and *poetiken* is unjustified¹ (for *quoque* preceding the word to which it refers see literature cited by Leumann-Hofmann, *Lat. Gramm.*, p. 662, § 232 Zus.). For *credo* referring to a following clause or phrase see the examples quoted in the Thesaurus, s.v. 1136. 74 ff. (e.g. Cicero, *Att.* iii. 15. 6: 'in quo ipso multa occul-

tant tuae litterae, credo, ne vehementius
desperatione perturber').

eius has apparently caused no misgivings, but the sense which it gives is surely impossibly weak: 'Atticus set his hand to poetry as well (as prose), so that he should not lack poetry's charm.' To recover what Nepos wrote, we must remember that the trait which he emphasizes most in his portrait of Atticus is the personal charm of the man: he charmed as a boy by his beauty of countenance and of voice (1. 3: 'summa suavitas oris atque vocis'); he charmed as a youth (2. 4: 'praeter

¹ Though adopted by Winstedt (Oxford text), whose critical note is inept.

gratiam, quae iam in adulescentulo magna erat'); he charmed by his latinity (4. 1: 'tanta autem suavitas erat sermonis Latini ut appareret in eo nativum quandam leporem esse, non ascitum'); his charm made him beloved (*carus*) by his friends (1. 4) and by all the Athenians (2. 3; 3. 3); Sulla himself was captivated (*captus*) by him (4. 1). In chapter 18, the concluding chapter of his original *Life of Atticus* (cf. 19. 1), Nepos deals with Atticus' literary works, first prose and then verse; both, according to Nepos, were as charming as the man himself. The description of the genealogical monographs on distinguished families concludes with the words 'quibus libris nihil potest esse dulcior iis qui aliquam cupiditatem habent notitiae clarorum virorum' (§ 4). Then comes the sentence in question, introducing the account of Atticus' verse epigrams composed for the *imagines*¹ of famous men. The sense we demand is that this—the charm of his verse—is the culminating quality which

¹ For the nature of this work see Schanz-Hösius *i⁴*, 332, and literature there cited.

was needed to complete the portrait of the man, and this sense we can obtain by reading *cuius* for *eius*. The confusion of the two words is common² in manuscripts; in our passage it would be particularly easy after *ne*.

The *ne* clause is, of course, not a real final clause (giving the purpose in Atticus' own mind) but a 'rhetorical final' clause³ (like those discussed by Mr. R. G. Nisbet in his article on '*Voluntas fati* in Latin Syntax' in *A.J.P.* xliv (1923), 27 ff.): 'it was as though (this is almost the effect of *credimus*) his purpose were'; the substitution of *cuius* for *eius* gives a purpose which is rhetorically effective instead of one which is rhetorically lame. The sentence resembles Tac. *Ann.* xiv. 16. 1 (of Nero): 'ne tamen ludicrae tantum imperatoris artes notescerent, carminum quoque studium adfectavit'.

W. S. WATT.

Balliol College, Oxford.

² e.g. Cic. *Att.* i. 16. 12 *cuius (domi)* *eius bN*; *Cic. Fam.* xvi. 23. 2 *cuius MFH*: *eius D.*

³ This is surely true even with the manuscript reading *eius*.

IN SUMMA

Juvenal iii. 78-80:

in caelum miseris, ibit.
in summa non Maurus erat neque Sarmata nec
Thrax
qui sumpsit pinnas, mediis sed natus Athenis.
79 ad summam P²ω.

In this passage *in summa* is generally taken to mean 'in short': 'to sum up'.¹ It is, however, difficult to see why the flight of Daedalus should be regarded as a summing-up of 76-8

grammaticus rhetor geometres pictor aliptes
augur schoenobates medicus magus, omnia novit
Graeculus esuriens;

where the point lies in the versatility of the Greeks. To conclude the list of Greek pretensions by saying that even flying is not beyond them is a climax, not a summing-up, and in any case the point has already been made by *in caelum miseris, ibit*. To this climax the

flight of Daedalus has an obvious relevance, not of course as a summing-up (two lines cannot sum up half a line) but as a mock justification, and the sense required is something like 'in fact' or 'after all'.

In several passages in Petronius *ad summam* seems to mean 'in fact'; for example c. 58, §7 'sed lapidarias litteras scio, partes centum dico ad aes, ad pondus, ad nummum. Ad summam, si quid vis, ego et tu sponsiunculam'—'But I know my capital letters etc. In fact, if you like, I'll have a little bet with you.' *Ad summam* is similarly used in c. 45, c. 57, and c. 77.² *In summa*

¹ e.g. 'In a word', S. G. Owen's translation: 'To put it shortly', J. D. Duff's note ad loc.: 'Pour tout dire', P. de Labriolle (Budé ed.).

² In c. 45 ad fin. Echion has described the poor performances of various gladiators at a show, and continues: *ad summam omnes postea secti sunt*. Heseltine (Loeb ed.) translates 'In short . . .' but the remark has much better point as a proof or justification rather than a summary of what precedes: 'In fact they were all flogged afterwards (which shows what the authorities thought about them).' In the other two passages Heseltine has

may also, I believe, have this sense in Juvenal. It is a common phrase in the contemporary Latin of the Younger Pliny, and certainly does not always mean 'in short'. It sometimes means 'finally', as in iii. 4. 8; iv. 15. 11; v. 1. 3. In i. 12. 12, speaking of the death of a friend, Pliny says 'doleo autem (licet me imbecillum putes) meo nomine. amisi enim, amisi vitae meae testem rectorem magistrum. in summa dicam quod . . . Calvisio dixi: "vereor ne neglegentius vivam".' Here the sense is 'In fact, as I said at the time, . . .'. So, too, in v. 6. 42, where Pliny tells his friend that he is not afraid that the detailed description of his villa may seem tedious, and continues: 'in summa (cur enim non aperiam tibi vel iudicium meum vel errorem?) primum ego officium scriptoris existimo, ut titulum suum legat atque identidem interroget se quid coepit scribere, sciatque, si materiae immoratur non esse longum, longissimum si aliquid accersit atque attrahit'—'In fact (I may as well give you my view for what it is worth) I regard it as the first duty of a writer to read the title of his work, to remind himself constantly of his subject and to realize that he becomes tedious not by dwelling on his subject, but by looking for and dragging in extraneous matter. In viii. 4. 8 *in summa* introduces a justification for a request and should perhaps have the sense 'after all'.

It seems likely that, at any rate in the 'in fact'. A. Ernout (Budé ed.) translates *ad summam* in all three passages by various expressions meaning 'in short'; in c. 58 he has 'tiens'.

time of Juvenal, there was little, if any, difference in meaning between *in summa* and *ad summam*:¹ that the basic meanings of both were 'in short' and 'finally', the senses which naturally derive from the meaning of *summus*; that because a sentence that sums up is often used to drive home an argument, and a final statement in a series tends to be the most emphatic, so both phrases sometimes came to be used in conversation and informal writing to introduce any sentence that drives home a point, even though it is neither a summary nor the last item in a series. For this sense 'in fact' is perhaps the most common English equivalent; 'after all' is sometimes a good rendering, and is a closer parallel to *in summa* in the development of its current sense from its literal meaning.

In Juvenal, then, whether *in summa* or *ad summam* is the true reading, the sense will in any case be 'You may even send him to heaven, and off he'll go. After all (or in fact) it was an Athenian and no other who first put on a pair of wings.'

P. T. STEVENS.

University of Liverpool.

¹ Possibly *ad summam*, which in various senses occurs ten times in all in the conversation of freedmen in Petronius, was the more colloquial. In Cicero *ad summam* occurs twice in philosophical works and several times in letters, generally with the sense 'in short' and sometimes with the sense 'in conclusion' (*Att. x. 4. 11*). Holden (on *Cic. Off. i. 149*) remarks 'Cicero never uses *in summa*, the phrase employed by Pliny'. He does actually use *in summa* in a letter (*Q.F. ii. 15. 3*), but in the middle of a sentence and apparently with the sense 'in all'.

ZEUS SELEUKEIOS

M. AND MME ROBERT have recently published new evidence relating to Zeus Seleukeios, in the form of an inscription from Hyrkanis in Lydia.¹ Another inscription from Lydia, published by Keil and von Premerstein,² refers to Zeus Seleukeios. Robert, following Keil and von Premerstein, connects the title of this god with the word Σελεύκιον, which occurs in a Sardian inscription³ and in an unpublished Delphian inscription,⁴ the former of

which certainly, the latter probably, refers to an athletic association of that name at Alexandria: Αλεξανδρείας Σελευκεῖον.⁵ All this evidence is from the late Imperial period.⁶

¹ In the Sardian inscription the spelling is Σελευκεῖον; in that of Delphi Σελεύκιον, v. note 6 below. Robert gives [Αλεξανδρείας Σελεύκιον. Professor Robert kindly tells me that only these two words survive on the stone.

² The inscription referred to in note 4 is not dated by Robert, but the form Σελεύκιον suggests an imperial date. The same itacism is found in the inscription quoted in note 2. Robert's Lydian inscription has Σελευκέω. These orthographical

¹ Robert, *Hellenica*, vi, 1948, pp. 24 ff., No. 4.

² *Zweite Reise*, pp. 101–2, No. 200; reproduced by Robert, loc. cit.

³ *Sardis*, vii. 1, No. 79 c, l. 22.

⁴ Quoted by Robert, loc. cit., p. 25, n. 4.

The origin of the word *Σελεύκειος*, both as an epithet of Zeus and when used absolutely, as in *Σελεύκειον*, has remained uncertain. Robert accepts the interpretation of Keil and von Premerstein that the god is an old Macedonian deity, Seleukios meaning 'the shining one', according to Hoffmann.¹ But no god of this name is known in Macedonia, and the etymology of the word is very doubtful.² Keil and von Premerstein and Robert were unwilling to connect *Σελεύκειος* or *Σελεύκιος* with the Seleucid dynasty owing to the appearance of the word in Alexandria. A. D. Nock³ preferred to connect the deity more closely with the Seleucid dynasty, but recognized the

difficulty of a cult of that house in Alexandria. He conjectured in passing that 'Σελεύκιος refers to the well-known Zeus of Seleucia Pieria'.⁴

In view of the obscurity surrounding this deity it is interesting to note that *Σελεύκειος* is one of a number of abnormal 'city-ethnics' of which the regular form ends in -eis. Two documents illustrate this: (a) A papyrus of 258/7 B.C. which refers to a [N]ākaw Σίμωνος Σελεύκειος,⁵ and (b) an inscription from the Valley of the Kings which bears Σ[αρ]ῆρη Σελεύκειος ἥκω.⁶ There are indeed strong *a priori* grounds for arguing that *Σελεύκειος* is not a 'city-ethnic' from the noun *Σελεύκεια*. Terminations in -eis commonly refer to persons and not to places.⁷ Similarly the 'city-ethnics' from place-names in -ea which end in -eis, and drop the -ea of the substantival form, have not been recorded as having an alternative form in -eis.⁸ Nevertheless it is quite clear that in both these documents *Σελεύκειος* = *Σελεύκεια*. Another abnormal form of the same type is *Ἀλεξανδρεῖος*, which is used for 'a citizen of Alexandria' in place of the normal *Ἀλεξανδρεὺς* in at least two instances;⁹ and it may be noted that, low though Stephanos of Byzantium's reputation in the matter of ethnics deservedly is, he records an alternative form *Ἀντιόχειος* for *Ἀντιόχεια*.¹⁰ A similar,

¹ Ibid., p. 42, n. 115.

⁵ B.G.U. 1228.

⁶ Baillet, *Inscr. grecs et lat. des tombeaux des rois*, i (Mémo de l'Inst. franç. du Caire, tom. xlii, 1926), No. 31. No. 1274, ibid., may be either *Σελεύκειος* or *Σελεύκεια*; only -λευκε- is visible.

⁷ e.g. *Λαοδίκειος πόλεμος*, I. von Priene, 37, l. 134, so called from Queen Laodike and not from a city called Laodikeia; *Χρημανίδειος πόλεμος* (Hegesander ap. Athen. 250 F); the common festival-names such as *Σελεύκεια* and *Ἀντιόχεια*; of *Σελεύκειος*, 'Seleucid troops', in App. Syr., § 125; the months *Σελεύκειος* and *Βόμβενος* at Ilion (O.G.I.S. 212, l. 11) and Pergamon (O.G.I.S. 338, l. 2) respectively; the coins such as *Ἀντιόχειοι* (sc. τέτραχοι), v., e.g., I.G. xi², 203 B, ll. 40, 46; and the numerous κοινά named after their founders and benefactors, all of which end in -eis (gen. pl.); v. Pugliese-Carattini, *Annuario*, N.S. i-ii, 1942, pp. 176 ff., for list of the Rhodian κοινά, many of which have this termination.

⁸ v. Dittenberger, *Hermes*, xli, 1906, pp. 168 ff., esp. p. 173: 'Und dazu kommt eine grosse Anzahl Ethnika, von denen überhaupt keine andere Form bekannt ist, wie Μαρτινέις, Κορωνέις, Λεβαδέις, Απολέις, Απαντέις, Κασσωνέις, Λαοδικέις, Σελεύκειος u.a.' Mention may be made here of the numerous valuable studies on ethnic forms by L. Robert. See, most recently, *Hellenica*, ii (1946), pp. 65-93. (For earlier discussions v. ibid., p. 66, n. 3, where for R.E.G. 1935, read R.E.G. 1933.) Robert here notices several alternative forms to ethnics in -eis, but the particular form of variant with which we are concerned is not noted.

⁹ Suidas, s.v. *Ἀλεξανδρεῖα*: δ πολίτης *Ἀλεξανδρεὺς*. καὶ *Ἀλεξανδρεῖος* (a reference I owe to Mr. C. H. Roberts); Baillet, op. cit., No. 619. In S.B. 5249, l. 4, *Ἀλεξανδρεῖον* may be from *Ἀλεξανδρεὺς* or *Ἀλεξανδρεῖος*; cf. above, note 6.

¹⁰ s.v. *Ἀντιόχεια*.

discrepancies due to itacism do not point to more than one form: the true form was undoubtedly *Σελεύκειος* (as in the Sardian inscription and in the documents quoted below). Genitives with intrusive iota in adjectival forms, such as *Λαυτρέως* in I.G. i². 1063, l. 2, are perhaps an earlier stage in the process which ultimately produced *Σελεύκειος*. Cf. Meisterhans-Schwyzer, *Grammatik*, pp. 46-9 (5), for further examples of the genitive termination in -eis. In the Gurob papyrus (*Chrest.* i = *F.Gr.H.* 160), col. ii, l. 8, the form *Σολεῖων* occurs, but there is nothing to suggest that the nominative singular was *Σολεῖος* rather than *Σολεῖς*. In this passage, Wilhelmi, Z. f. Öst. Gymn. 1894, p. 912, followed by Holleaux, *B.C.H.* xxx, 1906, p. 333 = *Études*, iii, p. 284, read Σφλ(ευκ)είων, and compared *ἱερέων* = *ἱερών* ibid., col. ii, l. 23. Wilcken, *Chrest.*, loc. cit., said, however, that the reading *Σολεῖων* was certain and that the alleged iota in *ἱερέων* 'gehört wohl nicht zur der Schrift'. (Holleaux rejected his former reading in *R.Ét.A.* xviii, 1916, p. 153, n. 1 = *Études*, iii, p. 279, n. 2.) It may be noted, however, that the alternative form *ἱερέων* is not uncommon in Egypt: in addition to *P. Strass.* 83, ll. 2 and 9, quoted by L.S.V., s.v. *ἱερέων*, v. *Chrest.* ii B, Fr. a, l. 2 (123 B.C.); *P. Grenf.* i. 25, l. 2 (cf. *Preisigke, Berichtigungsliste*, p. 180) (114 B.C.); *P. Adl.* 3, col. ii, ll. 2, 8 (112 B.C.); ibid., No. 9, ii, l. 2 (104 B.C.). (Why the editors of *P. Adl.* 18 and 21 should put as a note to l. 2 of each papyrus 'l. *ἱερέων*' I do not understand, since they have omitted the note in the other papyri here referred to.)

¹ O. Hoffmann, *Die Makedonen*, 1905, pp. 174-5: Hoffmann equates *Σελεύκειος* with *Ζάλευκος*.

² v. Solmsen, *B.P.W.* xxvii, 1907, col. 272, referred to by Robert, op. cit., p. 25, n. 3. The most recent work on the Macedonian language, that of I. I. Russu, *R.I.G.I.* xix, 1935, has a wholly different derivation. He says, ibid., p. 100 (after having discussed the derivation from the root -λευκος): 'Se invece separiamo Σέλευκος in Σέλευκος (il gruppo ευ non formando originariamente un dittongo) ne risulta un nome composto in cui la prima parte . . . trovasi in Σέλεπτιν in *Tebt. Pap.* i. 9043 [read 90, 43], *Σελεβός* (persiano), ibid. i, 110 ecc., e la seconda . . . è frequente nell'onomastica traco-frigica etc. . . .' (cf. id. *Eph. Dac.* viii, 1938, pp. 121, 215). This derivation sounds more plausible than that of Hoffmann; if correct it makes a literal interpretation of *Ζεύς Σελεύκειος* very difficult.

³ J.H.S. xlvi (1928), p. 42.

though not identical, variant is *Tuá̄tos* for *Tuá̄tēs*.¹

It is possible, then, that the association at Alexandria may be connected with Seleukeia, perhaps having been established by citizens of that city resident in Alexandria, in honour of the Zeus of their city. It is natural to suppose the Seleukeia in question to be Seleukeia-in-Pieria. Numerous cults of Zeus are testified there,² and it is in accordance with the normal practice of the Hellenistic and Greco-Roman world that resident merchants, etc., in large centres such as Delos, Rhodes, and Alexandria should establish shrines and *κοινά* to the gods of their home-town. This interpretation is supported by the close commercial connexion between the Syrian Seleukis and Alexandria in the Imperial period. Strabo says of Laodikeia: *εἰτα Λαοδίκεια ἐπὶ τῇ θαλάσσῃ καλλιόρα ἐκπομένη . . . τοῖς μὲν οὖν Ἀλεξανδρεῖον αὐτὴν παρέχει τὸ πλεῖστον τοῦ οἴνου*.³ A connexion between Seleukeia and Alexandria in the sphere of religion is suggested by the story that the statue of Serapis came to Alexandria from Seleukeia.⁴

This explanation of the word *Σελεύκειος* in Alexandria, if correct, removes the difficulty felt by previous writers in explaining the word in its Alexandrian context.

In the Lydian documents the title may well be derived from the Seleucid dynasty, the old masters of Lydia; a derivation from a city called Seleukeia seems less probable, while the interpretation of *Σελεύκιος* as 'the shining one' remains only a possibility.

PETER FRASER.

Brasenose College, Oxford.

¹ Baillet, op. cit., No. 1028. Note also the variant *'Ηράκλειος* for *'Ηρακλεάρης* in Durrbach, *Choix*, Nos. 151, 157.

² Cook, *Zeus*, ii (1925), Index i, s.v. 'Seleukia Pieria', and, most recently, H. Seyrig, *Syria*, xx (1939), pp. 296-301.

³ Strab. 751-2.

⁴ v. Levy, *Rev. Hist. Rel.* lxi, 1910, pp. 169-77; Roussel, *Syria*, xxiii (1942-3), pp. 26-7, discusses the slight evidence for the dispersion of Egyptian cults in the Seleukis.

MARE PIGRUM ET GRAVE

'Sed mare pigrum et grave remigantibus peribent ne ventis quidem perinde attolli, credo quod rariores terrae montesque, causa ac materia tempestatum, et profunda moles continui maris tardius impellitur.' (Tac. *Agricola* 10. 6.)

TACITUS' observations on the sea off the north of Scotland have usually been held to be simply an echo of the tradition, already ancient in his time and dating back at least to Pytheas, of a 'sluggish' and half-congealed sea in the Far North.¹ Tacitus' remarks in this passage, however, are more specific; he is writing apropos of the Roman

¹ See, e.g. J. O. Thomson, *History of Ancient Geography*, pp. 147 ff. (with a useful collection of the references); especially p. 149, n. 1.

landing in the Orkneys and discovery of a Thule that was probably the Shetland mainland; and in pointing out that storms were slower to rise in northern waters than in the land-locked Mediterranean he puts his finger on a very material fact. But what has seldom been observed by classical scholars and perhaps never adequately expounded in a commentary² is that the very phrase, *mare pigrum et grave remigantibus*, which has so often puzzled translators and commentators, really is an accurate description of a phenomenon familiar to sailors of small craft in the Pentland Firth.

My pupil Mr. J. L. Whiteford, who was stationed in the Orkneys during part of the late war, found Tacitus' account (obviously drawn at second hand, through Agricola himself, from Agricola's sailors) very much to the point, coinciding, in fact, with what Orcadian fishermen told him about their own waters. This was, first, that the strong tidal currents in the Firth and in the ocean north of Orkney are the most treacherous feature of these areas, and 'since they are often running against the wind, their power is felt rather than seen. Reaching rates of from 6 to 11 knots, they are sufficient to immobilize or even carry backward a vessel under full sail. No wonder the puzzled "remigantes" found the sea "sluggish and heavy".'

'High winds', continues Mr. Whiteford, 'are not as constant a feature of those waters as common [modern] report would have them, but they do occur. They give rise to a heavy swell, rather than the violent disturbance which Roman sailors would associate with storms in the Mediterranean. Very rough water is to be found in the *rōsts*, where the sea rushes over a shallow and uneven bottom. But Tacitus' brief description can give only the main features, and the slowly heaving Orkney sea . . . can have no better description than *pigrum et grave*.'

A. R. BURN.

University of Glasgow.

² See J. G. C. Anderson, ad loc., who refers to 'the contrary tides and currents off the north-east of Scotland, against which even sailing ships can often make no way'; but who combines this with the Pytheas-mythology, and thus scarcely brings out the appositeness of Tacitus' phrase.

A FRAGMENT OF MUSONIUS

In her essay on 'Musonius Rufus "The Roman Socrates"' (*Yale Classical Studies*, x, 3-147, 1947) Miss C. E. Lutz has given us an edition of the remains of Musonius. She has, however, overlooked one small fragment, quoted by Origen, to be found in H. Cadou, *Commentaires Inédits des Psaumes*, 118 (1936). The passage runs: 'Ο μὲν Ἐλλήνων φιλόσοφος Μουσώνος παραδέξως εἰπὼν ταῦτα ἔθαψάσθη ἀντρέτον τὸ λοιδόρον καὶ τὸ πικρὸν λοιδόρον, ἀλλὰ καθ' ἕντοῦ τὸν θυμὸν καὶ τὴν πυκλαν ἀνατιθηγητέον ἀλλὰ κατὰ τῆς ἐν ἡμῖν ἥδυπαθελα'.

G. D. KILPATRICK.

The Queen's College, Oxford.

REVIEWS

THE STYLE OF AESCHYLUS

F. R. EARP: *The Style of Aeschylus*. Pp. vii + 175. Cambridge: University Press, 1948. Cloth, 12s. 6d. net.

In this worthy successor to *The Style of Sophocles*, the characteristic method is, again, the use of lists of words, which is defended by Professor Earp in his Introduction, though it needs little defence, provided its limitations are as clearly recognized as they are by him; and the printed lists themselves are invaluable to the student. Where it is a matter of classification (e.g. what is to rank as a 'rare' word or a 'striking' metaphor), the subjective is bound to enter; no two scholars would agree on every particular, or with themselves on successive days, but E. has weighed his verdicts with scrupulous care and a fine sense of language.

'The style of Aeschylus is full of what the Greeks called *όγκος*, which we for want of a better word call "grandiloquence". It abounds in rare and archaic words and forms, in heavy and sonorous compounds, many of them new, and often containing a metaphor.' 'He revels in metaphors, and does all kinds of violence to language, and so is often obscure.' E. sets out to show that, despite the admitted grandiloquence and obscurity, the style of Aeschylus is governed by a deliberate art, whose chronological development can be studied in the extant plays. (He gives a late date to the *P.V.*, while regarding its stylistic problems as probably insoluble in default of further evidence.) This development is not, as in Sophocles, towards simplicity. Though the use of 'rare and epic' words tends to decrease, metaphor becomes more frequent, forcible, and elaborate; similarly, the coinage of 'heavy compounds' becomes bolder, while their employment as epithets (and that of epithets in general) becomes less ornamental, more dramatically significant. Thus the style, while it does not change fundamentally, is adapted to the dramatist's purposes with a finer art.

These points are sound and well supported. It is, indeed, the chief service of the book that it demonstrates so clearly that neither grandiloquence nor boldness of metaphor is used by Aeschylus as the conventional ornament of a grand style, least of all in the later plays. E.'s demonstration errs, if at all, on the side of caution. In the *Persae*, for instance, of the fifty 'heavy compounds' which receive a detailed examination, at least twenty are not merely designed to give a general 'impression of oriental pomp', but emphasize specific themes which the dramatist wishes to bring into prominence (the wealth, the man-power, the methods of fighting, of the Persians). Admittedly, however, there is more ornament in the earlier plays; and of the few 'ornamental' epithets which E. notes in the *Oresteia*, the majority disappear out of this class on closer investigation: e.g. at *Cho.* 546 and 898 φίλον and εὐτραφές of γάλα have irony; at *Eum.* 628 ἐκηβόλουσιν has appropriateness to the speaker; at *Agam.* 1580, if we read παγαῖς for πέπλοις, the epithet ceases to be ornamental, which is a good reason for reading παγαῖς. (So E.'s conclusions help the textual critic, though he does not himself discuss questions of reading —wisely, for if he had allowed himself to become bogged in the textual criticism of Aeschylus, we might never have had this book. Instead, he follows Sidgwick's text, as being readily available. Another text would have given lists differing in many particulars, but would not, I think, materially have affected the conclusions.)

On metaphor E. has many good things to say, but some important things are left unsaid. He catalogues the sources from which Aeschylus draws his metaphors (and similes); comparing earlier and later plays, he notes that 'striking' metaphors become more frequent and that, even among metaphors of the common stock, the less obvious come to be

preferred. He observes that, in the *Oresteia*, the metaphor often describes 'not so much the object in itself as its effect on the mind' and so gains in dramatic value. What E. fails to take into account is something which might be called the structural use of metaphor. This cannot be brought out by counting occurrences. According to E.'s figures, 'naval' metaphors are hardly more frequent in the *Septem* than in the *Supplices*, but the image of 'the ship of state' is used at salient points in the *Septem*, where it seems to have a special significance in relation to the situation and behaviour of Eteocles. The immediate effect of a metaphor in its primary context is often well discussed. *Agam.* 1066-7 (*χαλυνόν . . . μένος*): 'it would be difficult to describe Cassandra's alleged state of mind more forcibly, or more vividly.' This is true, but the choice of metaphor is determined by a whole pattern of references to constraint and freedom, actual and metaphorical, in which Cassandra and her conqueror are associated. *Agam.* 1180 (*ἡλίου πρὸς ἀντοάδα*): "'towards the sunrise", for the midday sun would not give the effect of light which he has in mind'. This shows how clear was the poet's visual imagery, but does not give the metaphor its place in the pattern of light and darkness which is structural to the trilogy:

the light of the rising sun should be a symbol of hope, but, like all the lights in the earlier part of the trilogy, proves to illuminate nothing but horror. In this way considerations of style lead into considerations of form which would greatly extend the scope of the book, but cannot safely be neglected in the treatment of metaphor, since they may have determined the choice and use of images, especially in the *Oresteia*, far more than personal experience and interest or even the demands of the immediate picture.

This is the chief criticism of a book which reveals the author's fine appreciation of Aeschylus at every turn. One of the most valuable chapters is entitled 'Some Qualities of Aeschylus'—these qualities being vividness, naturalness (E. rightly maintains that Aeschylus is, in some ways, the most naturalistic of the three tragedians), and humanity. No reader will cavil at the inclusion of this chapter in a book on style. It is, indeed, more relevant than might appear at first sight. For these qualities are expressed through a style with which, on a superficial and conventional view, they might seem to conflict. The chapter thus makes an important contribution to the main thesis of the book.

R. P. WINNINGTON-INGRAM.

Westfield College, London.

THE BACCHAE

R. P. WINNINGTON-INGRAM: *Euripides and Dionysus: An Interpretation of the Bacchae*. Pp. viii+190. Cambridge: University Press, 1948. Cloth, 15s.

THE author showed the first draft of this book to Professor E. R. Dodds in 1939, and from it presumably, as 'an unpublished essay', the latter quotes 'several acute observations' in his edition of 1944. Professor Winnington-Ingram in turn counts himself fortunate that Professor Dodds's edition of the play appeared before his own book was in final shape. The two books consequently regard each other in some sense.

W.-I.'s interpretation consists of a running commentary flanked by four

general chapters. The commentary, in which much, though not the whole, of the play is translated (W.-I.'s own translation with borrowings of turns of phrase), confines itself to exposition of the dramatic significance of the text and leaves matters of pure scholarship aside. In length it works out at nearly a page to each ten lines of the text, and the whole book runs to about 80,000 words.

After Professor Dodds's exhaustive edition it may be doubted whether there is all this much more to be said about the *Bacchae*. W.-I. justifies the appearance of his work on the ground of the great diversity of interpretations, and rightly observes that a new one is no use unless put forward thoroughly and

in a
who.
deed
mas-
and
tion,
of hi
But
the
nizes
essen
more
play
D
duct
play
trod
gion
the
in di
grou
own
W.-I
(p.
conci
that
Dion
univ
the
socie
meth
phil
oth
emp
proa
the
bolis
Euri
truth
Dod
'fron
dice,
not
imp
elem
acco
histo
histo
(Aes
fers
To
inter
a clo
ting

be a
ights
oves
In
ould
but
treat-
have
nges,
han
even
ure.
book
pre-
One
ttled
these
ness
is,
c of
ity.
n of
is,
bear
are
rich,
ew,
The
on-
the

in
of
wn
of
nd
de.
ge
he
ds.
ve
re
ut
r-
he
nd
no
and

in a way which takes account of the whole play in all its details. And, indeed, if justification for the book lies in mastery of the subject, acute and sensitive criticism, a high degree of dramatic and poetic imagination, fluent exposition, and a sympathetic understanding of his author, W.-I. has made his case. But he himself claims to do justice to the wood as well as the trees: he recognizes an end to which these are mere, if essential, means, viz. an idiomatic, and more satisfactory, interpretation of the play as a whole.

Dodds gave a warning in his introduction (p. ix) that 'the *Bacchae* is a play about an historical event, the introduction into Hellas of a new religion', and that 'if we attempt to seize the poet's thought by a frontal attack, in disregard of the contemporary background, we shall be at the mercy of our own, or other people's, prejudices'. W.-I. makes a frontal attack: he believes (p. 161) that the play is only slightly concerned with contemporary cult and that 'Euripides has taken the primitive Dionysiac legend and discovered in it universal significance and symbols of the blind working of emotion in human societies and individuals'. In fact, each method, though based on a different philosophy, is complementary to the other. Dodds did a great service by emphasizing the neglected historical approach. W.-I. has recognized, at least, the contemporary sources of the symbolism through which, he contends, Euripides strove to express the eternal truth about one side of human nature. Dodds does, indeed, imply that all 'frontal attacks' are flawed by prejudice, but historical interpretations are not free of it, in so far as the degree of importance attached to the different elements in a causal complex varies according to the preconceptions of the historian. Professor George Thomson's historical interpretation of the *Bacchae* (*Aeschylus and Athens*, pp. 139 ff.) differs greatly from that of Dodds.

To what extent, then, does W.-I.'s interpretation lack the objectivity which a closer attention to the historical setting would, it is claimed, have given?

Do 'his own, or other people's, prejudices' stand between him and the poet? Not, in the reviewer's opinion, to any serious degree. A certain relativity of critical truth is generally admitted in the claim that each generation must interpret the classics afresh for itself. If W.-I. explains Euripides' analysis of the state, and effects, of emotionalism in terms of modern popular psychology, if his Teiresias is a little over-Anglican and his poet conceived rather on Bloomsbury lines, the subjectivity lies more in the language than the content of his exposition.

Viewed as a response to historical events, the play becomes a piece of advice to the Athenians on the subject of the new ecstatic Oriental cults. This, to W.-I., is too trivial an aim for a play which, however difficult, bears the marks of greatness in form, in language, and in the sober earnestness of its tone. He insists (p. 152) that 'myth and cult in combination provided Euripides with unsurpassable symbols for the poetic expression of his theme', which expands in ever widening circles of reference, from Dionysiac worship itself, through all emotional forms of religion, to emotionalism not specifically religious, in individual, as well as in social and political, life. He regards Pentheus as an essentially Dionysiac, i.e. emotionally unstable, character whose inward struggle gives him no peace, while the Bacchanals, by surrendering themselves to the life of emotion, gain that peace and harmony which is so vividly described in the first and second choruses, 'but is it worth the cost? That is the fundamental issue of the play' (p. 39).

In conclusion the reviewer would take up three points. (1) On p. 168 W.-I. seems surprised to find that the poet, whom he has endowed with such a lofty theme, must have regarded his *sophia*, not as mere *expertise*, but as an instrument of social good. 'The play is more than an exhibition of technical skill, it is a revelation.' But 'art for art's sake' is a modern idea. To Greeks the general meaning of *sophia* was always the revelation of truth to men, whether by poet,

teacher, or scientist. The tragic poet has his place in society because he reveals to his countrymen the fruits of his insight into human life and character. (2) At the climax of the play (p. 102) the explanation produced a sense of bathos in the reviewer: ‘‘Ah,’’ says Dionysus, perhaps with an intense stare and a grasping of Pentheus’s hands.’ (3) It is difficult to accept the translation of 895—

which makes *dei* a predicate. Dodds argues that *τὸ νόμημα* and *τὸ φύσει* cannot be identical, as Sandys explains, because they are habitually contrasted. But there was a well-recognized trend which saw *physis* as the result of *nomos* (see Heinemann, *Nomos und Physis*, Basel, 1945, i, pp. 13 ff.).

J. S. MORRISON.

University of Durham.

DEMOCRACY IN GREEK LITERATURE

T. B. L. WEBSTER: *Political Interpretations in Greek Literature*. (Publications of the University of Manchester, Classical Series, No. VI.) Pp. vii + 149. Manchester: University Press. 1948. Cloth, 7s. 6d. net.

PROFESSOR WEBSTER claims to have adopted the same method in his new book as he used in *Greek Interpretations* (M.U.P. 1942), ‘i.e. long quotations from Greek literature with commentary’. Difference of aim has, however, modified this method. In the earlier book W. had the general aim of setting down his views on certain phases of Greek literature and art, and the particular purpose of propounding a method of teaching Greek in English. There, accordingly, the main weight fell on the passages chosen for quotation, and the book is essentially an exegesis of Greek literature. The aim of the new book, on the other hand, is ‘to show how the essential ideas of democracy at various stages of development were expressed by Greek poets and prose-writers from Homer to Aristotle’, and it is, accordingly, much less a commentary on certain lengthy passages than an argument illustrated by quotation from the relevant authors. W. does not claim for this book that it will be useful in teaching Greek literature, but, instead, that it will be ‘a contribution to’ (the solution of) ‘modern problems’.

In the first place, there is a great advantage in having a documented summary (in 149 pages) of the development of political thought and practice in Greece, written, not by an authority on politics or economics who finds in antiquity material for a brief, but by a

scholar of wide interests and knowledge. No less refreshing is the absence of dogma, which usually inspires, and at the same time vitiates, surveys of this field. If on one occasion the moderate oligarchy of 411 B.C. is represented as devising *nomoi* which would leave the greatest freedom to *physis*, the resemblance to modern attempts to reconcile controls with free enterprise is no doubt a matter of coincidence. Originality of treatment in detail is hardly to be looked for, and would be out of place, in a work of this kind, whose originality lies in the attempt to do what English scholarship, on the whole, seems to avoid, and present in outline the meaning of Greek civilization in one of its aspects. W.’s *humanitas* and the wide scope of his knowledge render the attempt valuable.

A few points may be made in criticism. The compression of much history into little space is skilfully done, but the general reader, for whom the book is intended, will be puzzled on occasion; as, for example, when he finds Alcibiades described on p. 78 as urging the abolition of the democracy and on the next page, without intermediate explanation, reads that ‘with the return of Alcibiades the full democracy was restored’. Again, on p. 83, he reads, ‘speech after speech refers to *homonoia*—the unanimity of all classes in the restoration’ of 403, and on p. 87 he hears of the excesses of the restored democracy. It is, no doubt, often the unsatisfactory nature of the accepted historical version itself which the degree of compression reveals, as in the case of Solon, who, as a political poet, invoked, like Tyrtaeus, as arbitra-

tor in a time of civil discord, is hardly to be placed in the same category as Cleisthenes and Pericles (p. 19). Brevity perhaps requires the use of such phrases as 'the Viking Mycenaean ships' (p. 1) and 'the Athenian national anthem' (p. 22), but the general reader will have no clue that the description is merely analogical. And the remark that 'Thales' experience . . . suggested that solids and gases could be derived from liquids' (p. 57) might lead the comparatively well-instructed into the anachronism of attributing such abstractions to the early physicists. Brevity has also led to the omission of reference to the political activities and theories of the Pythagoreans. Archytas perhaps deserved a mention in view of his influence on Plato.

The phrase, on p. 8, describing the difference between Hesiod and Homer, 'poetry no longer looks backward to the great deeds of the past', suggests, what can hardly be true, that in the age of Homer there was not popular poetry like Hesiod's, only not written down, and that in the age of Hesiod professional poets at the aristocratic courts did not praise famous men. The re-

viewer finds it very difficult to accept, with W., Livingstone's identification of the Eumenides in Aeschylus' play with the defeated conservatives at Athens (p. 39). Aeschylus' parable seems more social than political, and to depict the reconciliation of automatic tribal convention with the new right of intervention claimed by the *polis*. W.'s tentative identification of Creon in the *Antigone* with Pericles (p. 52) rests insecurely on the parallel between Creon's remark at line 186, and Pericles' phrase in Thuc. ii. 60, 3. *Apragmosyne* (p. 45, cf. p. 66) seems the ideal less of the aristocrats than of the intellectuals who made the revolution of 411. W.'s reference of higher education at Athens to the itinerant sophists alone (p. 105, cf. p. 87) leaves out of account the indigenous tradition represented by Antiphon and his father Sophilus and going back, as Plutarch says (*Them.* 2. 4), to Solon himself.

On p. 12, line 25, there appears to be a misprint, *for* instead of *far*. On p. 135 a word in Greek characters has crept in.

J. S. MORRISON.

University of Durham.

THE XENOPHONTIC CONSTITUTION OF SPARTA

K. M. T. CHRIMES: *The Respublica Lacedaemoniorum ascribed to Xenophon: its manuscript tradition and general significance*. Pp. 48. Manchester: University Press, 1948. Paper, 7s. 6d. net.

MISS CHRIMES begins her interesting study with a discussion of 'the original form of the treatise', and makes the suggestion that its c. 14 (on the present corruption at Sparta), which is obviously out of place, was originally c. 1; and that the author was intending something like, 'I know Sparta is not now what she was and is unpopular in consequence, but I admire her age-old constitution and way of life', just as the author of the Ps.-Xen. *Constitution of Athens* begins, 'I don't approve of the Athenian democracy, but I admit it is logically worked'. She then shows, by a very ingenious but not, I think, entirely convincing palaeographical argument,

that the displacement of this c. 1 could have been caused by the outer sheet of a codex, containing this c. 1 on its first two pages and the last c. (15) on its last two, becoming loose and being inserted together at the end, and then the whole codex being mistakenly copied. The argument is fortified by a similar displacement in Stobaeus' lengthy extracts from the *Resp. Lac.*, though that is a displacement of one of the two middle leaves. If this is sound, the present c. 14 was composed at the same time as the rest, and we can discuss the date of the treatise as a whole; for the only chronological data in it are contained in c. 14.

So far good; but Miss Chrimes does not really ask herself whether the treatise, as rearranged by her, opens in a natural manner, if the author's intention also is what she supposes: *εἰ δέ τις με ἔρωτο εἰ καὶ νῦν ἐπι μοι δοκοῦσσεν οἱ*

Λυκούργου νόμοι ἀκίνητοι διαμένειν, τοῦτο μὰ Δία οὐκ ἀν ἐπι θρασέως εἴποιμι. οὐδὲ γὰρ πρότερον μέν, κ.τ.λ. This is not really like the opening of the *Resp. Ath.*: *περὶ δὲ τῆς Ἀθ. πολιτείας, ὅτι μὲν εὔλογο τοῦτον τὸν τρόπον τῆς πολιτείας, οὐκ ἔπαινον διὰ τόδε· . . . ἐπεὶ δὲ ταῦτα οὐτῶς ἔδοξεν αὐτοῖς, κ.τ.λ.*, and seems to me impossible; and we cannot suppose the loss of a sentence or two at the beginning, for that would upset the palaeographical argument. Similarly: Miss Chrimes makes out a good case for dating the treatise c. 395 B.C. rather than c. 376, but she does not strengthen it by saying that it is clearly demonstrated 'that the force of the word *πάλιν* in the sentence *νῦν δὲ πολλοὶ παρακαλοῦσιν ἀλλήλους ἐπὶ τῷ διακαλύψει ἄρχαι πάλιν αὐτούς* (14. 6) is not "again" but "on the contrary". How could it mean 'on the contrary' with this order? If it necessarily follows from *πάλιν* = 'again' that c. 14 could only have been written c. 376 or later, back it must go to that date.

She denies that Xenophon can be the author; and, again, her arguments from the external evidence (Polybius, Demetrius Magnes, and, especially, Arrian) are good, but those from internal considerations weak. She does not compare this work, in structure and

language, with others by Xenophon except, briefly and somewhat disingenuously, to admit similarities, which she attributes to Xenophon's knowledge of it. And having rejected Xenophon, she goes on (with confidence: 'it has now been demonstrated') that the date is 395, that it is not by Xenophon, that it was written in and for Athens) to ask who did write it. It was someone of the Socratic circle, for did not Socrates say he admired Spartan education? Hence, by the *eena, meena, mina, mo* method: not Critias (dead), not Plato—this is gratifying, anyway—or Crito (who only used dialogue form), not Aeschines or Euclides (not in Athens), therefore Antisthenes. Yet there is nothing in the treatise characteristic of Antisthenes, as far as we know him, though Miss Chrimes tries to show close similarity of opinion; it is difficult therefore to see the significance of attaching his name to the work. (Was Antisthenes interested in military tactics?) Miss Chrimes thinks it must be the work of someone well-known, or it would not have been preserved through Alexandrian times: preserved by men who did, or who did not, know whose work it was?

A. W. GOMME.

University of Glasgow.

ARISTOTLE'S POLITICS

Sir Ernest BARKER: *The Politics of Aristotle*. Pp. lxxvi+411. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1946. Cloth, 15s. net.
Sir Ernest BARKER. *The Politics of Aristotle*. Pp. xxvii+452. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1948. Cloth, 12s. 6d. net.

THE later of these two editions is a shortened version of the earlier. The translation is substantially unabridged, only a few passages having been omitted and summarized, and the notes for the most part remain, but the Introduction has been considerably cut down and the book printed in the same size and form as the Oxford edition of the *Republic* in Cornford's translation, to which it is no doubt intended to be a companion volume. A chronological table and a

glossary have been added. If one may assume that Sir Ernest's intention was what the *Times Literary Supplement* says he has achieved in the earlier and larger volume, to 'put it in the power of an intelligent man who knows no Greek to gain a true understanding of one of the great masterpieces of political thought', then one may perhaps regret that nothing is said in the introduction to the smaller and later volume about the composition of the *Politics*. Detailed discussion of rival theories is no doubt out of place in a work intended for the intelligent general reader. But what must puzzle the intelligent general reader, or for that matter the undergraduate with no Greek and little knowledge of Aristotle, is the very miscellaneous

and ill-arranged nature of the work; and it would have helped him to be told that the work is not so much a treatise on Politics as a series of lecture notes on political subjects, put together, perhaps by an editor, on the plan suggested at the end of the *Nicomachean Ethics* but having no consecutive overall design. He would then not have too high expectations in the way of lucidity and consecutive argument, and would be able to understand the abruptness of the style, which Sir Ernest amplifies with additions in square brackets when the argument is particularly obscure.

With Sir Ernest's analysis, in the Introduction to the earlier volume, of the contents of the *Politics* and with his somewhat sceptical conclusion about the possibility of dating the various sections which that analysis reveals, and so discovering how Aristotle's political thought developed, the reviewer is in substantial agreement. Books VII and VIII clearly belong together and give us an uncompleted sketch of the ideal *politeia*. Books IV and V again belong together, and are a realistic study of actual political problems. With them goes Book VI, which springs from the same movement of thought and shows the same realistic approach, though it is a separate *methodos*. Books I, II, and III are separate series of notes on various political subjects—the family, ideal constitutions, and so on. But it is much harder to see how these different strata are related, and one may remain, with Sir Ernest, unconvinced by either Jaeger's or von Arnim's attempt to date them. Jaeger's view of Aristotle's development in particular the reviewer has questioned on other grounds in *C.Q.* xlvi (1948), pp. 61–7; and once that view is questioned Jaeger's dating of the strata of the *Politics* has little positive evidence to commend it.

The remainder of the introduction to the larger volume contains sections on the historical background, on the personality of Aristotle, and on the Lyceum and its studies, and on the substance and argument and vocabulary of the *Politics*; in the shorter volume all that

remains of this is the section on the vocabulary. This section on vocabulary is particularly useful, since it emphasizes for the modern reader the differences in terminology between Greek and English, and the consequent difficulties of accurate translation. One may sometimes disagree in detail; but the whole is set out with that leisured lucidity of which Sir Ernest is a master. The device of expanding Aristotle's often very brief notes by adding words in square brackets is a useful one. It has, of course, the disadvantage that it swells the bulk of the work still further; and no two translators would fill in the gaps in Aristotle's reasoning in exactly the same way. But, as anyone who has lectured on any book of Aristotle knows, his notes are irritatingly brief at times and the connexions of thought obscure, and the first duty of a commentator is to expand the text and fill in the gaps in the argument; a bare literal translation is apt to leave the reader impressed but unenlightened. Sir Ernest has made sparing use of his square brackets and on the whole his additions are uncontroversial.

In the shorter edition most of the passages omitted are of historical interest only; though in these days when the tyrant is again a factor in politics one may perhaps regret the omission from Book V, ch. x, of 'instances of revolutions in tyrannies due to the tyrant's personal misconduct'. The glossary in this edition contains definitions and explanations of a number of Greek terms used by Aristotle in the *Politics* and supplements the note on vocabulary in the Introduction.

There is no doubt that these two volumes will come to be regarded as a standard translation of the *Politics* for English readers. Those who have Greek will doubtless also continue to use Rackham's masterfully lucid version in the Loeb library (regretting that he did not use Bekker's chapter divisions, thus making reference difficult); but they, too, owe Sir Ernest a debt for what he himself calls this 'labour of love'.

H. D. P. LEE.

Clifton College.

THE NICOMACHEAN ETHICS

Jean LÉONARD, S.J.: *Le Bonheur chez Aristote.* (Académie Royale de Belgique, Mémoires, Classe des Lettres, Tome XLIV, fasc. 1.) Pp. iv+224. Brussels: Académie Royale, 1948. Paper, 80 B.fr.

THIS is a valuable contribution to the literature of the *Nicomachean Ethics*. We regret to learn from the introductory biographical note that in 1945, a year after his work received the crown of the Royal Belgian Academy, the author died at the age of thirty; there is reason to think that this was a real loss to the study of ancient philosophy.

While the book is not a complete study of *E.N.*, it ranges over it widely in handling its conception of happiness in relation to external goods, pleasure, contemplation, and virtue. The most striking contributions are those made to the second and third of these topics.

In ch. 3 Léonard discusses the conflicting treatments of pleasure in *H* and *K*, and makes a sound case against Festugiére for holding that in *H* Aristotle is, equally with Eudoxus, a hedonist—a hedonist, nevertheless, who refuses to differentiate between an activity and the pleasure to which it gives rise (1153^{b9-12}), and who, even so, shows hesitancy in his position (1152^{b25}, 1153^{a7, b8}).¹ L. is thereby enabled to strengthen the arguments of Festugiére himself for holding that *H* 1152^{b1}-end must be assigned to *E.E.* (cf. *E.E.* 1216^{a16-22}).

Chapter 5 inquires into the meanings of *σοφία* and *φρόνησις* in *Protrepticus*, *E.E.*, and *E.N.*, discussing the controversy between Jaeger and Margueritte as to whether *φρόνησις* in *E.E.* ever means 'practical wisdom', as M. maintains. It concludes judiciously that *φρόνησις* in the earlier Aristotle is not always theoretical wisdom alone, but that the sharp distinction between theoretical and practical had not yet been drawn.

In examining the chronology of *E.N.* L. discusses the arguments of Nuyens

¹ Cf. the interpretations of Stewart (*Notes on the Nic. Eth.*, vol. ii, p. 221) and of Rassow (*Forsch. ü. d. nik. Eth.*, pp. 48-9, quoted in part by Stewart).

in his *Ontwikkelingsmomenten in de zielkunde van Aristoteles* (1939). One of the most striking features of that work is that N., taking the narrow criteria of the relations of soul to body and of *voùs* to the rest of the soul as his guide for dating the entire body of A.'s writings, is led to place the whole of *E.N.* in the middle period of his activity, not much later than *E.E.* This view L. is concerned to controvert, and he devotes an appendix to an attack on N.'s dating, so far as *K* is concerned. There seems every reason for holding, with Jaeger, Ross, and L., that *K* was one of A.'s latest productions. In effect L.'s attitude to N.'s work (for whose importance, nevertheless, he shows a real appreciation) is substantially that of K. O. Brink (*C.R.* lvi, 1942, p. 31), and of H. J. D. Lulofs in his edition of *De Insomn.* and *De Div. per Somn.*—that, despite its great value, it is too limited and too rigidly schematic (was A.'s thinking ever so completely co-ordinated as it assumes?), and is unjustified in its tendency to take whole works as homogeneous unities. L. says nothing of A. Nolte, *Het godsbegrip bij Aristoteles* (1940), which applies to A.'s theology the methods by which Nuyens treats his psychology, and which concludes similarly that both *E.E.* and *E.N.* belong to A.'s middle period. Presumably his criticisms would have run on the same lines here again.

L. does well to emphasize the part played by contemplation in A.'s picture of the ideal life from the beginning to the end of his career, and this forms a valuable element in his book; at the same time he is careful not to conceal the tentative and incompletely co-ordinated character of A.'s philosophy. (For instance, as the criticisms in Theophrastus' *Metaphysics* bring out, A. never described satisfactorily what he supposed our knowledge of God to be like (pp. 145 ff.).) That *E.N.* is not a unitary whole he himself urges (p. 86), as was indeed argued by Case in his article 'Aristotle' in *Enc. Brit.*, ed. 11; may we go farther, and suggest that his

question whether (let us say) *Z* belongs to *E.N.* is somewhat too sharply formulated? The piecemeal character of A.'s compositions has become increasingly clear in recent years: is it not here that the solution lies to the difficulties of analysis? That *Z* is not a unitary whole was shown as long ago as 1888 in Shute's *History of the Aristotelian Writings*. How far such inquiries can take us it is difficult to say, but a study of the language seems to reveal, for instance, that in *Z* neither 1138^b18–34 nor 1138^b35–1139^b13 harmonizes with the more mature passages which follow, and that the treatment of *ἀκρασία* in *H* is not completely homogeneous.

L. devotes a careful and interesting

appendix to A.'s suggestion that happiness is not to be numbered among the goods (1097^b14 ff.), and discusses the interpretations of the ancient commentators.

Though attractively produced, the book is unfortunately marred by a number of misprints and minor inaccuracies of reference, of which the following are a sample: on p. 80 n., read *Γ. 7* and ἔστι τὸ ηδεσθαι καὶ λυπεῖσθαι τὸ ἐνεργεῖν; on p. 110, n. 3, read 1243^b33; on p. 126 (ad init.) read 1178^b33; on p. 131, n. 2, *Phdr.* 250 A; on p. 133, n. *Ti.* 90 c and ἀνθρωπίη φύσει; on p. 134 (ad fin.), *Met. A.* 1072^b14–26.

D. A. REES.

University College, Bangor.

A BIOGRAPHY OF HORACE

Henry Dwight SEDGWICK: *Horace, A Biography*. Pp. ix + 182. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press (London: Geoffrey Cumberlege), 1947. Cloth, 16s. net.

'QUINTUS HORATIUS FLACCUS! The Spirit of Civilization has placed a crown upon his head. His name has shone, and still shines, like a beacon shedding a gleam over the ocean of Time, for nearly twice a thousand years.' Such is the opening sentence of this *Biography of Horace*; the last is 'For he's a jolly good fellow', etc. The style throughout is correspondingly breezy and enthusiastic. Colloquialisms like 'high jinks' or 'rattle away' abound, while unusual phrases such as 'clinquant words' or 'the defense' (? i.e. repulse) 'of the Titans by the gods' may perhaps fall less strangely on transatlantic ears than on ours.

The first twenty-two chapters trace the career and poetical development of Horace, and three further chapters discuss his philosophy, his art, and his fame. The biography is full and well-proportioned, and the political and social background is sketched in. In the main the facts are accurate but there are a few slips. It is misleading to describe the centurions' sons who attended Flavius' school as 'boys of the upper class, sons of old army officers' (p. 5). Callimachus is curiously listed among

the lyric poets along with Pindar, Anacreon, and Stesichorus (p. 17). The statement that the Epistles to Augustus and Florus were published together about 19 B.C. as Book II of the *Epistles* is incorrect: by general consent the former was not even written until some six years later (p. 127). S. further seems to be unaware that the *Ludi Saeculares* were omitted in 49 B.C., or that Augustus replaced the old cycle of 100 years by an entirely new one of 110 years (p. 135).

When evidence is scanty S. uses his imagination to fill out the picture—notably in his treatment of Horace's women. After stating that they were 'but part real', he then—rather inconsistently—pictures them as cheering Horace's life on the Sabine Farm with their company. Lyde (*Od.* ii. 11) is actually assumed to be the pretty daughter of one of his tenants, 'a charming young neighbor intimate enough to know where the Caecuban was stowed in his cellar'.

The book is liberally supplied with illustrative passages from Horace's works. Sometimes they are given in the original Latin, but more commonly in prose translation or free paraphrase. The fifth and ninth *Satires* of the first book and several of the *Odes* and short *Epistles* are translated in full. For the *Odes* C. E. Bennett's translation is

occasionally adopted. The other translations appear to be S.'s own: they could sometimes be happier and more accurate in their phrasing, e.g. 'please be quiet' (*fauete linguis*); 'that which would be sacrilege to change' (*quicquid corrigeret nefas*).

S. touches on three controversial points. He makes a spirited defence of Maecenas against charges of foppery, effeminacy, and slovenliness: 'whether he was overfond of haberdashery, or negligent, I take it that Maecenas dressed for comfort and to please himself, indifferent to the sartorial code of the Palatine Hill'. He argues that it was unlikely that Horace was present at Actium—an opinion with which most people will agree. He also maintains (in an Appendix) that Horace cannot have possessed a villa at Tibur in addition to his Sabine Farm, on the ground that such pluralism 'would have given the lie to his preachings': the evidence of *Ep.* i. 8. 12 (*Romae Tibur amem uen-*

tosus, Tibure Romam) he dismisses by reminding the reader 'that Horace was obliged to use words that fitted with his meter'.

From the above it will be seen that this volume contains little that will be useful to professional scholars, but S. disarms criticism by claiming that he writes 'for those who read Horace merely for pleasure'. Within these limits his *Biography* appears to be quite a useful contribution, and his genial enthusiasm for Horace and his works may well commend it to the general reader. Even the scholars are likely to be grateful to him for at least one comment—that 'if ever a man should have had a pipe it was Horace'.

The book is attractively printed and there is a brief index. The proofs have been carefully read and only a few misprints have been noted,—mostly in Latin words.

T. E. WRIGHT.

University of St. Andrews.

TIBULLUS

Luigi PEPE: *Tibullo Minore*. Pp. xi + 159. Naples: Armanni, 1948. Paper, L. 700.

Esther BRÉGUET: *Le Roman de Sulpicia. Élégies IV, 2–12 du 'Corpus Tibullianum'*. Pp. 352. Geneva, Georg, 1946. Paper.

THE thesis of *Tibullo Minore* is that Tibullus wrote the poems that since the Renaissance form the third book of the *Corpus Tibullianum*. The author of the first four of these poems and of the sixth and last is the suitor of a Neaera, and calls himself Lygdamus. The fifth poem does not belong to the Neaera-cycle, but there is no obvious reason for assigning it to a different author. What appears at first sight to be a conclusive argument against identifying Lygdamus with Tibullus was noticed by Scaliger, who nevertheless refrained from drawing any conclusion: 'eruditioribus amplius considerandum relinquimus'. J. H. Voss, if not more learned, was more resolute, and enjoys the credit of having shown that Lygdamus and Tibullus cannot be the same. Later scholars have

added many arguments, which are in general too subjective to carry any conviction by themselves, or futile because they draw unwarranted conclusions from similarities and dissimilarities. Pepe, who has a good knowledge of the literature of Tibullus, brings a salutary scepticism to bear upon it, but however many fallacies he may demolish, Scaliger's original difficulty remains. The author of the fifth poem dates his own birth in the lines

natalem primo nostrum uidere parentes
cum cecidit fato consul uterque pari.

The pentameter recurs in Ovid's *Tristia* (iv. 10. 6), where the couplet takes the form

editus hic ego sum necnon, ut tempora noris,
cum cecidit fato consul uterque pari.

Ovid was therefore born in 43 B.C., when the consuls Pansa and Hirtius both fell in battle. If Lygdamus (whether the name is real or fictive) was also born in 43, he cannot be identified with Tibullus, who accompanied Messalla on his Aquitanian campaign in 31.

Pepe resolves this difficulty by an original suggestion. Need we assume, he asks, that the passages of Ovid and Lygdamus refer to the same date? May not the point of Ovid's 'plagiarism' be that the old words get a new meaning? Lygdamus could have been born in 66, when the two consuls-designate were 'unseated' on a charge of corrupt practices, an event several times mentioned by Cicero. The date of Tibullus' birth is unknown. It is usually placed about 54. Pepe argues that 66 is not too early, even although the *Vita* declares that he died an *adulescens* (in 19 B.C.). The poems of Lygdamus will be youthful work of Tibullus. This cuts the ground from under the feet of critics who say that the two poets cannot be the same because Lygdamus is much inferior, shows no love of the country, etc. Tibullus for some reason saw fit to adopt a pseudonym; even so he did not publish the elegies, which only saw the light posthumously, perhaps along with the present second book; this guess may be supported by the fragments of a manuscript tradition that grouped them with it as the second book of Tibullus. Ovid respected Tibullus' pseudonymity, making Delia and Nemesis his only loves, but he imitated 'Lygdamus' as freely as he imitated Tibullus; most significantly his poem on the death of Tibullus combines allusions to the death-bed scenes imagined by Tibullus and by 'Lygdamus'.

To establish the possibility of his theory Pepe urges that Tibullus cannot have achieved his technical excellence without writing *iuuenia*; that Horace, *Odes* i. 33 and *Epist. i. 4* are to be dated before 30 B.C. and confirm this early writing; that Lygdamus' poetry is the sort of thing a less experienced Tibullus might have written, and that the resemblances between Tibullus and Lygdamus are such that Lygdamus must be the earlier. All this is written with an attention to psychological probability that gives it an interest and value, whatever may be the truth of the main thesis. As to that, Pepe certainly gives cause for considering whether there is a secure foundation for the orthodox opinion

that Lygdamus cannot be Tibullus. But it may be doubted whether he establishes, or even makes it likely, that they are in fact to be identified. His argument is largely based on resemblances of language and theme, treacherous ground because we possess only a small fraction of the Latin elegiacs that were written and read in the Augustan age—

scribimus indocti doctique poemata passim—

and because it is easy to mistake coincidence for reminiscence or imitation: the limitations of elegiac vocabulary and the exigencies of metre are bound to beget parallels.

If Ovid did in fact conflate Lygdamus' and Tibullus' imaginary death-bed scenes for his *epicedium* on Tibullus it would indeed be a strong argument for the identification of the poets. But the similarity between Ovid's

hinc soror in partem misera cum matre doloris
uenit inornatas dilaniata comas

and Lygdamus' hope that Neaera

ueniat longos incompta capillos

sed ueniat carae matris comitata dolore

does nothing but illustrate the well-known fact that female relatives attended death-beds and did so with dishevelled hair.

For my own part I consider that the only parallel passages of any value are those which show that three successive and not particularly striking couplets in Lygdamus 5 made a deep impression on Ovid's memory. This is a strange fact, but will not serve to solve the Lygdamus problem. Nor, perhaps, is a solution to be found.

Dr. Bréguet, too, believes that she can demonstrate the authorship of some disputed poems. She is well aware of the dangers of arguing from similarities, and although in her vast book she frequently calls attention to what can have no conceivable significance, forgetting the maxim *tout dire est trop dire*, her methods are in principle sound, and she bases no inferences on such passages. She has conducted a careful examination of the metre, language, and themes of the two

authors of the Sulpicia-poems, comparing them with Propertius, Tibullus, and Ovid. This examination makes it difficult to believe that Tibullus wrote iv. 2-6. Although there are certain striking similarities, there are also many significant differences. For example, Tibullus never elsewhere uses the familiar or prosaic expressions *si sapiis, crede mihi, pone metum, erit aptius*, or the supine, or *-ne . . . -ne* as double interrogatives, or the Greek words *lampas* and *pelagus*. Again there is a series of common words used in these poems in a sense not found in Tibullus: *ignis* and *calere* as part of the erotic vocabulary, *superbus* (3 times) in a good sense, *candidus* 'kindly', *uestigia* 'feet'. In many of these points the poems differ not only from Tibullus but also from Propertius, which makes chance a less likely explanation; but the usages are in every case Ovidian, and often typically Ovidian. In these circumstances it is worth while to notice that most of the unusual words and usages in the Sulpicia poems are also to be found in Ovid: *indago*, *plaga*, *restituo* (restore to life), *subsequor*. There are other features that recall Ovid: the irreverent address to Mars, the antiquarianism of *Mane Geni* and *ter tibi fit libo*, or such epigrammatic lines as

optat idem quod nos iuuenis, sed tectius optat
and

mille habet ornatus, mille decenter habet.

CICERO DE RE PUBLICA

G. H. POYSER: *Selections from Cicero, De Re Publica*. With a Foreword by Hugh Last. Pp. xx+151. Cambridge: University Press, 1948. Cloth, 6s. net.

An edition of Cicero's *De Re Publica* must be either very elaborate, treating all the problems of fragmentary text and subject-matter, or very simple and selective, illustrating the spirit of Roman tradition in Cicero. Mr. Poyser's edition, in the latter class, is designed for the general reader, who will profit by studying Cicero's own account of his political ideas. In an admirable fore-

Dr. Bréguet draws the conclusion, already less cautiously argued by R. S. Radford, that Ovid wrote Tibullus iv. 2-6. I think she establishes that the author belonged to Ovid's generation, but that he actually was Ovid seems doubtful. One argument against it is the preference shown in the hexameter for the metrical form SDSSDS. Dr. Bréguet thinks that in writing these poems Ovid imitated some of the superficial features of Tibullus' style. That, for some reason, he might have done; but why should he have favoured a form of the hexameter that both Tibullus and he himself elsewhere used comparatively sparingly?

The book contains much statistical matter on the metrical and linguistic usage of Propertius and Ovid, as well as of Tibullus, which may be valuable to other scholars if used with reasonable caution. So many pages must contain some errors of detail. I note, for example, that Dr. Bréguet in spite of i. 6. 2 and i. 8. 28 does not allow Tibullus the use of *tristis* to mean 'cold', 'unkind'. She allows him *sed tamen*, which appears, indeed, in many texts at i. 4. 54, but to the discredit of their editors: the conjecture *sed male r-*, which will occur to anyone who looks at the passage, was made by Santen. *seruato* (i. 6. 16) is omitted from a list of Tibullus' future imperatives.

F. H. SANDBACH.

Trinity College, Cambridge.

word on the rise and present importance of the 'humanities' Professor Last indicates that 'the purpose of this book is double—to provide an introduction to the Cicero who did more for the making of our civilization than the Cicero of the *Speeches* or the *Letters*, and to help us the better to understand ourselves'.

The introduction discusses the purpose of the *De Re Publica* with reference to Cicero's authorities and shows how Cicero's Roman attitude helped him to master his material and present it as an independent work. Despite his debt to such men as Dicaearchus or Polybius,

Cicero stresses the importance of individual men and the ethical aspect of government; in this context we find Panaetius as the spokesman for Stoic ethics and Plato as the ultimate source of the concept of 'justice'. With regard to the 'mixed constitution' Mr. Poyser might have clarified the issue further by paying more attention to the view that Polybius began with the 'mixed constitution' theory—reasonably ascribed in its contemporary form to Dicaearchus—and added to it the Stoic 'anacyclosis' theory of the progressive degeneration of constitutions—which can be ascribed to Panaetius. This is conveniently set out by F. W. Walbank, 'Polybius on the Roman Constitution', *C.Q.* xxxvii (1943), pp. 73 ff., and has useful application to Cicero (*ibid.*, p. 85, n. 6). This view would allow more definite acceptance of Dicaearchus' responsibility for the 'mixed constitution' of the *De Re Publica*.

In connexion with Cicero's debt to Plato Mr. Poyser discusses his attitude in Scipio's praise of monarchy and relates it to the conception of the 'rector' as an element above the constitution and introduced to ensure its stability. The 'rector', he holds, is not permanent and does not anticipate dictatorship or principate: the conception is not of *munus* but of *auctoritas* as personal ascendancy, similar to the Hellenistic idea of kingship in its relations with Stoicism, and possibly enunciated by Panaetius. The question of the 'rector' is too complicated to be summed up fully in a brief introduction, and Roman ideas of *imperium* may be more important than Mr. Poyser allows; but his statement clarifies the issues. Had Cicero anyone in mind as 'rector', a man of his own age like Scipio Aemilianus earlier? Himself? Mr. Poyser dismisses this in a footnote. Or Pompeius? Not the Pompeius of 54-51 B.C., when Cicero was writing, but (says Mr. Poyser neatly) 'the sort of man that Cicero once hoped Pompeius would be'.

The selection of passages gives as much continuity as possible in Books I and II. Omitting the general opening, the text begins with the full argument

on political science at i. 19. 31 and runs through to the end of Book II with only slight omissions, usually before and after lacunae in the manuscript. There are short extracts from Books III and V, and the opening of the *Somnium Scipionis*. The text is based on that of Keyes in the Loeb edition and needs little discussion; but Mr. Poyser makes some changes and these permit comment on his text. He keeps *regni* at i. 32. 49 and *rex* at i. 33. 50 and drops *Scipio* at i. 37. 58, with good reason. At i. 34. 51 he keeps *velint*, but at i. 47. 71 unnecessarily accepts the emendation *habeamus* for *habemus*. His discussion of i. 36. 56 neglects the slight signs in the manuscript that one should read *docti indoctique [exploriri]*: *docti expolitique* will hardly serve. At ii. 5. 10, whatever the true reading may be, something more concrete than *absorberet* appears necessary. The conjecture of *politico* (rather than, say, Ziegler's *perpolito*) at ii. 29. 51 is clever. But is it, considering Mr. Poyser's own standards elsewhere, palaeographically too drastic? At ii. 3. 6 *adesse* is preferable to *esse*. For fuller textual evidence the most useful work is now Castiglioni's Paravia edition (1936).

The commentary is concise, relevant, and gracefully written: it meets the needs of one reading the text in the spirit of the Introduction. Difficult phrases are pleasantly rendered, e.g. i. 29. 45 *divini paene... viri*: 'superman'; i. 34. 51 *optimos* in its context: 'aristocrats by merit'. At i. 26. 41 *delubris distinctam spatiisque communibus* is too loosely translated 'divided into parts sacred and secular', without reference to 'common use'; at ii. 42. 69 *inmutatum aut discrepantem* is hardly 'changed to discordance' but rather 'altered (interrupted) or discordant'.

The explanation of difficult passages is very clear; supporting citations from Cicero are well chosen; and there are apt quotations from other political thinkers, e.g. Mazzini, which take up the general implications of Cicero's words. At i. 40. 62, however, it is probably enough to see Scipio speaking in character. At i. 35. 55 *caritas* called for fuller treatment. *Caritas* of

monarchies is probably more than 'the affection they inspire': it is rather ambivalent, meaning 'love' as a mutual bond, and *caritas, consilium, libertas* here correspond to the Platonic *φιλία, νοῦς, ἀλευθερία* (if not influenced by the Roman *imperium, auctoritas, libertas*). Mr. Poyer's own note on *benignitas* at ii. 20. 35 could be quoted to support this broader rendering. In this connexion

add to the bibliography M. Pohlenz, 'Cicero de re publica als Kunstwerk' in *Festschrift Richard Reitzenstein* (1931), pp. 70 ff.

Mr. Poyer's book is to be welcomed, especially by those who turn to Cicero's ideas for the clarification and reinforcement of their own thought.

A. H. McDONALD.

University of Sydney.

QUINTILIAN XII

Quintiliani *Institutionis Oratoriae Liber XII*. Edited by R. G. AUSTIN. Pp. xlvi + 246. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1948. Cloth, 12s. 6d. net.

A NEW edition of almost any book of the *Institutio Oratoria* would be welcome to those modern scholars who still maintain that traditional respect and affection for Quintilian which was felt so strongly from the Renaissance to the eighteenth century. Apart from a few continental editions, almost exclusively of Books I and X, and the excellent guidance of Colson and Peterson on those books, the student has generally to go back (unless he contents himself with the Loeb) to the commentary of Spalding, which has long ceased to be adequate for modern needs; though Cousin's *Études sur Quintilien* is a reliable companion. Book XII, though not so interesting to the student of education as the first and second books, or to the literary critic as the celebrated tenth, presents Q.'s final views on a wider range of topics than most of the other books, and well deserved separate treatment. Professor Austin has done a valuable service in providing so thorough and trustworthy an edition of the culminating book of Quintilian's work.

A well-written Introduction discusses the relationship of the book to the whole work, its value as a social document, its philosophical alinement, treatment of oratorical style, relationship to the *Dialogus*, internal arrangement, and manuscript tradition (including a useful *conspectus* of variant readings). A good bibliography is added.

Professor Austin finds a number of difficulties in the arrangement of the

book (pp. xxvii–xxx). He may be right in believing that Q. published the *I.O.* without a final revision; he is certainly right in criticizing those who see in Book XII little more than a patchwork of disconnected topics. Some use might perhaps have been made here of Norden's article on the structure of the *Ars Poetica*, for Horace's treatise, whatever its detailed pattern, is closely analogous in general *dispositio* to the *I.O.* (*Hermes*, xl, 1905, pp. 486 ff.; cf. K. Barwick, *Hermes*, lvii, 1922, pp. 43 ff., 66 ff.). Norden argues that the *I.O.* and the *A.P.* are both based on the traditional division, common in other rhetorical and 'isagogic' works, of *ars* (*artifex*), and that Book XII has a definite unity of conception, as it represents the different facets of the orator himself, as opposed to the technique of his art (Books II–XI). Q. has several references to this principle in Book XII (5. 1; 9. 1; 10. 1). Moreover, as Horace, when he begins discussing the artist himself, closely relates the *munus et officium poetae* to the philosophical studies which help to form his character (ll. 306–16), so Quintilian proceeds naturally from the character of the orator (c. 1) to philosophy, law, and history—the studies which form his intellectual equipment (cc. 2–4). But it is certainly curious that Q. should have dealt so cursorily with history in c. 4.

The text, of course, takes close account of Radermacher's Teubner edition (vol. ii, 1935), although it has not an *apparatus criticus*. Where it differs from R., the reasons given are generally convincing. It is interesting to note that, although A.'s text agrees with that

of R. against the reading common to Halm and Meister in 38 places, at no less than 55 points (some of them small) it reverts to their reading against R. The text is fairly conservative, the boldest expedient being the adoption of Stroux's transposition at 2. 28, which may well be right.

The translations offered are always vigorous, often quite racy. Exception may be taken to 9. 11, where the rendering of *plane adversarii fiunt et inimici* as 'in plain fact opposing counsel are actually turned into personal enemies' seems very forced owing to the separation of *plane* by a noun and verb from *et inimici*; surely 'they (i.e. *advocati partis adversae*) become thoroughly antagonistic and hostile' is more natural.

The explanatory notes are clear-cut and often remarkably apt, with plentiful illustrations, particularly from Q. himself and Cicero's *Rhetorica*. The treatment of c. 10 (on art-analogies and literary criticism) is admirably thorough. To the parallels adduced from Dionysius the following may be added: 10. 24 *vatis comparandum*, cf. the criticisms of Plato's style as 'poetic' in *De Dem.* c. 5; 10. 43 *cui si res indicare satis esset . . .*, cf. *De Lys.* c. 5 *ώς μὲν ιδιώτη δηλῶσαι βούλομένω τὰ πράγματα ἀποχρῶ . . .* etc.; 10. 60 (the middle style compared to a clear, smooth-flowing stream), cf. *De Dem.* c. 4 *ώσπερ οἱ μῆ κατ' εὐθείας ρέοντες ποταμοί*, c. 5 *ώσπερ τὰ διαφανέστατα τῶν ναυάρων*. Small points are: 2. 15 *translatio* is not a transference 'from one legal basis or *status* to another'; it is itself one of the four (Hermagorean) *status*. 2. 29 *dicta ac facta paeclare* in this context strongly suggests comparison with the title and contents of Val. Max. 3. 7 'inventio' is more often used of 'style' is badly expressed. 6. 4 the

pro Roscio passage was evidently a stock *τετράκωλον*, cf. Sen. *Contr.* vii. 2. 3 with ix. 2. 27. 8. 5 *declinandum*, perhaps 'side-tracked' rather than 'toned down'? cf. Cic. *Part. Or.* 18. 63 *ad persequendum aliquid aut declinandum*. Grammatical notes are often exemplary, e.g. 5. 3 on attraction of gender of relative pronoun, 2. 17 on *tenus*. One of the most important interpretations (though anticipated, as the editor notes, by earlier editors and by E. A. Hahn in *Language*, 1941, pp. 24 ff.) is on 10. 27 ff., where A. maintains that Q.'s two pleasant Greek letters missing in Latin are not *v* and *φ*, as often supposed, but *v* and *ζ*, i.e. *y* and *z* (cf. C.R. Ivii. 9 ff.). Textual uncertainty makes against definite decision (*Zopyris* as plural of a proper noun is unconvincing, and *zopyris* is obscure in botany), but the puzzle should interest philologists.

The following references would appear to need correction: i. 8, for 'i. 12. 27' read 'i. 10. 27'; i. 21 (fin.), for '*Orat.* 19' read '*Orat.* 14'; i. 22 (*Asinio*), for '*Suas.* vi, fin.' read '*Suas.* vi. 14'; i. 28 (*excidere*), for 'ii. 16. 3' read 'ii. 16. 8'; i. 30, for 'viii. pr. 36' read 'viii. pr. 26'; i. 36, for 'iii. i. 56' read 'vii. i. 56'; i. 37, for 'x. i. 79' read 'x. i. 71'; i. 40 (*periclitantibus*), for 'xi. i. 21' read 'vi. i. 21' or 'xi. i. 49'; i. 41, for '*Agr.* 2' read '*Agr.* 3. 2'; 2. 9, for 'x. i. 67' read 'x. i. 87'; 2. 22 (*monumenta*), for 'ix. i. 12' read 'iii. i. 12'; 2. 28 fin., for '*Sil. It.* viii. 225' read '*Sil. It.* viii. 295'; 3. 7, for 'vi. i. 1' read 'vii. 6. 1'; 3. 9, for '*Cic. Mur.* 36' read '*Cic. Mur.* 29'.

But it is ungracious thus to harp *corrigere, sodes, hoc . . . et hoc*, and to play Quintilius to Professor Austin's Quintilianus; his edition is an excellent one, and will long remain standard.

S. F. BONNER.

University of Liverpool.

THE APOCOLOCYNTOSIS

Carlo F. Russo: L. Annaei Senecae *Divi Claudi Apocolocyntosis*. Pp. 158. Florence: La Nuova Italia, 1948. Paper, L. 800.

THE *Apocolocyntosis*, despite its brief compass, has given rise to an amount of

scholarly activity which would have warmed the heart of the pumpkinified Claudius himself. In the last thirty years we have had commentaries from Marx, Sedgwick, Weinreich, Rossbach, and Sieveking, as well as critical editions

by Waltz, Rostagni, and Ronconi. Signor Russo's edition is therefore inevitably in the main a compilation—a careful and scholarly one—recording and weighing the work of his predecessors.

Yet it is not merely that. In pp. 19-33 he lists, with brief descriptions, 28 *codices recentiores*, of which 11 were hitherto unknown and others had not been collated. For his collations of these we must wait for a critical edition to be published in Italy in the near future. In the meantime we are told that they are all descended from S, V, or L, and hence valueless for the constitution of the text. (In that case, we may ask, why trouble to publish their readings in full when paper is in short supply?) In a study of the interrelations of the three principal manuscripts Russo shows that V and L are independent witnesses to a tradition different from that of S. Agreement of SV or SL therefore enables us to reconstruct the archetype in many passages.

The editor's conjectures are few: in 2. 3 he reads *<adeo his> adquiescunt*, in 7. 5 *<e>go tulerim*, in 8. 2 *oro, per <quid>? quod*, in 9. 1 *<non licere patribus> sententiam dicere*. In general his text is conservative: he retains the manuscript reading *quantum via sua fert* in 9. 2 with Ussani (*Riv. di Fil.* xli (1913), p. 75), and in 14. 3 he keeps the unmetrical reading of the manuscripts *aīke πάρος τά τ' ἔρεξας, δίκη κ' ιθεῖα γένοιτο*, supporting it with an excellent note on the modes of quotation in the ancient world.

In matters of literary history R. shows sound common sense, rejecting alike the theory (recently supported by Ronconi and Toynbee) that the *Apocolocyntosis* was written long after Claudius' death, and the view (to which countenance has been given by Waltz and Rostagni) that it was a protest against Agrippina's deification of her late husband. Birt's and Rossbach's doctrine that Seneca wrote both an *ἀποθέωσις* and an *ἀποκολοκύνθωσις* receives short shrift, as does Barwick's variation on the same theme.

In his interpretation of the title *ἀποκολοκύνθωσις* R. returns to the view of Fromond that it is not to be interpreted etymologically, but that it suggests, to those who have ears to hear, the burlesque deification of a fool.

The origin and history of the literary form, and the relation of the *Apocolocyntosis* to the *Satiricon* of Petronius, are rather hastily skated over. One would have liked more than two pages on the problems involved.

In a commentary which averages ten lines to each line of text a reviewer can easily find matter to cavil at: on p. 80 *praeputium* is not a 'vocabolo ibrido (prae-πόσθιον)';¹ on p. 87 the note on *postmeridianus consul* is unsatisfactory—the allusion is surely not to the fact that 'nei pomeriggi delle giornate romane non si faceva pressochè nulla'; on p. 95 the justification of *quis* as a relative pronoun is hardly convincing for Seneca, and the *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* in the succeeding line is not explained—reference should have been made to such passages as *C.I.L.* i. 198. 14. On the other hand, the notes on 10. 3 ('crux criticorum', as Ruhkopf called it), 13. 6, and 14. 2 are models of lucidity, and all three contain useful new material. Throughout the commentary R.'s indebtedness to Bücheler is evident.

I am not competent to judge the Italian translation which follows the text. The volume is rounded off by a useful series of indexes.

Misprints are more frequent than one would have wished, though none occurs at a critical point. On p. 22 R. says that codex Parisinus Lat. 5055 does not contain the Greek portions of the text: yet Bücheler (*Kl. Schr.* i. 503) quotes a Greek passage from it.

Italian students—and their teachers—will find Signor Russo's edition most valuable. For the rest of us it will worthily replace the now unobtainable German editions.

R. BROWNING.

University College, London.

¹ An error copied from Ball, who inherited it—via Lewis and Short—from Forcellini!

ANCIENT GEOGRAPHY

J. O. THOMSON: *History of Ancient Geography*. Pp. x+427; 2 plates, 66 maps and diagrams. Cambridge: University Press, 1948. Cloth, 42s. net.

SEVENTY years after the appearance of Sir Ed. Bunbury's standard work on the Ancient Geographers, a new book on the subject has been produced by Professor J. O. Thomson which is also plainly destined to have a long run. The new volume is based on a thorough study of the literature, ancient, modern, recent, and 'stop-press', and is replete with references which weight the footnotes down to the Plimsoll line. Thomson's reading, moreover, is well digested. Though now and then he conveys the impression of having been caught between two minds, he gives abundant proof of his powers of independent judgement; and the cool scepticism with which he scrutinizes the travellers' tales and fancy theories that abound in ancient authors is a most laudable form of austerity.

In particular, Thomson shows a good grasp of mathematical geography; but he also writes discerningly on the chief descriptive geographers, Polybius and Strabo. His references to ancient China are unusually full and adequate, and his last chapter, on the decline of ancient geography, provides both entertainment and a suitably sombre background to the earlier achievement. The maps are plentiful and illustrate both the range of ancient travel (e.g. the excellent map of India on p. 303) and ancient conceptions of the earth.

In arranging his materials Thomson has done well to abandon Bunbury's disposition according to authors, substituting a classification by periods, with subdivisions, where necessary, according to continents. This system will enable the reader to assess more clearly the general progress from period to period. He wisely separates the global and mainly mathematical geography (*γεωγραφία* proper) from the regional descriptions (*χωρογραφία*). But he might usefully have gone farther by providing distinct sections for the chorographies,

and for the records of actual travel on which the chorographies were based: where these two subjects interweave, the landmarks tend to become blurred.

The sheer abundance of Thomson's material has constrained him to compress it severely, in order to keep it within certain limits. This *peine forte et dure* has sometimes resulted in Thucydidean obscurity. Some of the footnotes read almost like cryptograms, and occasional passages in the text need a little easing; e.g. on p. 75, ll. 12-13, 'the male Gorillas defended themselves with stones (text? found refuge in the heights)'; on p. 110, l. 23, 'the globe was first mooted' (i.e. the sphericity of the earth first came under discussion); on p. 119, ll. 7-8, 'The globe must be of no great size, Aristotle knows, as the stars change markedly in quite a short distance' (i.e. even a slight shift of latitude will produce a noticeable change in the star-map).

Of the multifarious points for discussion which this book raises only a few can be taken up here.

i. Down to 500 B.C. (i) Homeric geography.—An ingenious attempt to distinguish between the Minoan or maritime and the 'Hellenic' or continental elements of the Homeric map has been made by E. Wiken (*Die Kunde der Hellenen von dem Lande und den Völkern der Apenninhalbinsel*). As was to be expected, the Minoan elements preponderate.

(ii) The alleged circumnavigation of Africa by Phoenicians.—Contrary to recent trends of opinion, Thomson minimizes the chances of this story being true. Certainly it is unlikely that the Phoenicians had a commission to encompass Africa from Pharaoh Necho (who was mostly absorbed in Asiatic warfare). Can it be that, adventuring themselves a little beyond their usual beat along the east African coast (in quest of Rhodesian gold?), they were taken in charge by the winds and currents that set round Africa from Zanzibar to Guinea, and guessed rightly that from Guinea their shortest way home

would be straight on to Morocco, and so along the Carthaginian trade-route past Gibraltar?

2. The fifth and fourth centuries. (i) The recession of Greek geographic knowledge.—Herodotus and Ephorus knew less about Spain than Hecataeus, and Ctesias was not so well informed about India as Herodotus. Thomson blames this narrowing of the Greek horizon on the scientific incuriousness of the Athenians. But was it not mainly due to *force majeure*, as applied by the Carthaginians in the west, and to Persia's eventual self-isolation?

(ii) The demonstration of the earth's sphericity, which was the main discovery of the Greeks in this period, was achieved by astronomic rather than by geographic observation, as Thomson points out. So long as the geographers could not disprove a circumfluent (or circumstagnant) Ocean, they could not dismiss out of hand the notion that the earth was a disk or drum (preferably with an outer rim).

3. The Hellenistic age. (i) Pytheas.—A systematic reconsideration of all the texts relating to this explorer has been undertaken by G. E. Broche (*Pythéas le Massaliote*). It is here pointed out that honey (which the people of Thule used for making mead) can be obtained in Iceland from wild bees. This removes the only serious doubt as to the identification of Thule with Iceland.

(ii) The Caspian Sea.—A waterway between this sea and the river Oxus has recently been established by Russian engineers (A. Mikhaylov, *Soviet Geography*, 2nd ed., pp. 129-31). The possibility of a similar connexion at some period of ancient history should therefore not be ruled out.

(iii) Eudoxus and Hippalus.—Their story has been thoroughly overhauled by W. Otto and H. Bengtson (*Abh. der bay. Akad., phil.-hist. Klasse*, 1938, pp. 194 ff.) and by J. H. Thiel (*Eudoxus von Cyzicus*). In both these works Hippalus is represented as a shipmate of Eudoxus who completed Eudoxus' interrupted quest of India. Thiel enhances Eudoxus' credit by pointing out that modern philologists have confirmed his observa-

tion that the natives of east and west Africa used a fundamentally similar vocabulary. The *μονσικὰ παιδισκάρα* whom Eudoxus embarked for his circum-African cruise, together with *ἰατροί καὶ ἄλλοι τεχνῖται*, were probably not, as Thomson supposes, intended as presents for Indian rajahs, but to entertain his crew: like modern explorers since Parry, Eudoxus realized the importance of keeping the ship's company in good spirits.

4. The Roman age. (i) Ptolemy's map-projections.—The two pages which Thomson devotes to this subject may require a few scholia for the benefit of the *ἀγεωμέτρητοι*. The main problem of the projector, the transference of the meridians and parallels from the globe to a plane surface, was solved by earlier map-makers by the simple device of drawing all the intersections at right angles (Mercator's projection). Because of the progressive exaggeration of distances in the higher latitudes which this method induces, Ptolemy discarded it. The 'secant conical projection' to which he finally had recourse requires a more advanced technique than he could command. To obtain satisfactory results it is necessary to measure precisely the length and relative distance of two standard parallels in the range of latitudes where accuracy of mapping is most essential, and from these bases to determine by trigonometrical calculation the position of the cone-apex in reference to which the meridians and parallels are drawn; else the parallels will be out of truth for the latitudes in question. But in principle Ptolemy's method of projection is still considered the best for large areas in middle latitudes (such as the ancient *oikouμένη*).

(ii) Ptolemy's later influence.—Ptolemy's manifold imperfections (duly animadverted on by Thomson) had the effect of starting the early modern geographers on false trails. The later medieval cartographers already drew with the aid of the compass far better coastal maps than those of antiquity. But these were mere route maps. The construction of accurate area maps was impossible without a systematic plotting

of co-
such
faulti
the f
value
trans
6.
τῶν.
true
Again
siona
has f

T. J.
xiv
Cl

THIS
south
the e
the g
their
men
the S
from
ture
was
colle
the t
all i
'selc
task
need
Sicil
deal
tha

B
is la
pre
cord
ally
tant
of t
who
ject
ther
cau
are
pub
som
tion
clas
por

of co-ordinates in latitude and longitude such as Ptolemy carried out, however faultily. It is therefore no accident that the first modern maps of any scientific value appeared shortly after the first translation of Ptolemy into Latin.

6. Conclusion.—*ἐν εὐφημίᾳ χρή τελευτῶν*. What applies to Ptolemy holds true of Greek geographers in general. Against their numerous errors and occasional sheer obtuseness, which Thomson has faithfully recorded and judiciously

discussed, we should set the fact that scientific geography was nevertheless their creation. In the words of a modern authority, E. de Martonne, 'Quand on songe à la faiblesse des moyens d'investigation dont disposaient les Anciens, on est étonné que la géographie générale ait pu faire de tels progrès.'

But the same *εὐφημία* should be accorded ungrudgingly to this book, which bids fair to hold the field for many years.

M. CARY.

THE WESTERN GREEKS

T. J. DUNBAIN: *The Western Greeks*. Pp. xiv + 504; maps and plans. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1948. Cloth, 35s. net.

THIS is an account of Greek activity in south Italy and Sicily from the eighth to the early fifth century B.C. and covers the foundation of the colonies, their growth and relations with the natives, their economic and cultural development, the conflict with Carthage, and the Sicilian tyrants. The evidence, drawn from archaeological finds, ancient literature, and topographical observations, was widely scattered, and the labour of collecting it can in part be guessed from the ten pages of bibliography, which for all its length is rightly described as 'select'. D. has done this portion of his task very well, and any student who needs references to south Italian and Sicilian material will be saved a great deal of trouble and find many items that he would otherwise have missed.

But though the mass of the evidence is large, it is incomplete and its interpretation is difficult. The literary records of early Greek history are generally scanty and too many of them are tantalizing scraps served up by authors of the Hellenistic and Roman periods whose ultimate sources can only be conjectured: for testing their reliability there is no accepted rule, except perhaps caution. The archaeological finds too are unsatisfactory. Many have not been published or even accurately recorded, some are of disputed date or classification, and they represent only a few classes (not necessarily of constant importance) of the material equipment of

the ancients. So before using any piece of evidence the student must first decide what it is and what conclusion can reasonably be drawn from it; and where, as often, the conclusion is doubtful he must state other possible conclusions or at least his line of reasoning. The weakness of this book is that too often it neglects these preliminaries.

Chapter I illustrates this weakness. D. accepts Blakeway's speculations on pre-colonial trade (*B.S.A.* xxxiii. 170–208), the fanciful reconstruction of commercial pacts and spheres of influence set out in *C.A.H.* iii, and as much of the literary tradition as he conveniently can. Such assumptions may pass in a short tendentious paper, but a book that sets out to be solid history should be more critical. To take pre-colonial trade, the evidence for this depends largely on the dating of the earliest Greek pots and native imitations of Greek pots (especially Siculan III) that have been found outside the colonial settlements: how many of them are earlier and how much earlier than the earliest finds from the colonies? Blakeway decided that there was a long and large series of pre-colonial pottery, but his relative dating has been criticized by R. S. Young (*Hesp.*, Suppl. ii. 3, n. 2), by J. D. Beazley (*C.R.* 1944, p. 31), and by the authors of the two most important recent studies of Italian and Sicilian material, E. H. Dohan (*Italic Tomb-Groups*, 29, 40, 45; cf. 105–9) and A. Åkerström (*Der geometrische Stil in Italien, passim*). Åkerström, to be sure, himself fell into error, and D. deals

justly with this in Appendix I. vii. For the rest D. observes 'Some archaeologists are inclined to give lower dates to certain of the vases described by Blakeway as pre-colonization imports from Greece. These dates may be accepted without thereby invalidating Blakeway's main thesis' (p. 1, n. 2). This is hardly fair, especially as no references are given for these awkward inclinations. My own impression is that measured by pottery the volume and duration of pre-colonial trade were small. Blakeway also spotted the handiwork of immigrant Greek potters as well as native imitators at some of his pre-colonial sites and detected a change from Panhellenic trade to Corinthian monopoly about 735–690 B.C.: again D. regards Blakeway's authority as sufficient and Åkerström's caution as 'retrogressive' (p. 468, n. 1). But Blakeway's identifications were never generally credited and now that more of the relevant material has been studied they need to be completely re-examined. Such unquestioning acceptance of doubtful opinions makes this chapter less reliable than it might have been, as the contrast with Appendix I makes clear: here D. defends the traditional dating of the foundations of the colonies, and his arguments (though several do not convince me)¹ are carefully reasoned and openly set out.

For the internal development of the colonies till the end of the sixth century the evidence is scrappy, but the summary in Chapter II is useful and the cautious conclusions are generally justified. The next three chapters, which cover the territorial expansion of the colonies and their relations with the natives, rely largely on archaeological observation, since the literary evidence is slight. D. surveys the finds from the neighbourhood of the colonies and analyses the proportion of Greek and native material, and from this he deduces which were Greek and which native settlements and how far Greek influence penetrated into independent

¹ On this and some of the other topics discussed by D. I have set out my opinions in *J.H.S.* 1946, pp. 67–98.

native communities. He also examines native influence on the Greeks and finds it negligible. This is the most important part of the book, well prepared and well argued, and is a valuable contribution to ancient history.

Chapter VI on communications and VII on agriculture are short and, so far as I can judge, to the point. D. rightly emphasizes the general self-sufficiency of the colonies. Chapter VIII on commerce is more ambitious and makes the hazardous attempt to reconstruct Greek trade from the evidence of pottery. After pointing out the long predominance of the pottery of Corinth D. inquires what other Greek cities may have traded with the west. For Rhodes, which he takes first, I do not think his knowledge of East Greek pottery altogether satisfactory. Next comes Athens, whose pottery in the sixth century supplanted Corinthian in the west (as elsewhere). D. seems to imply that the Corinthian government from deliberate policy encouraged the export of Attic pottery (pp. 241–3): I should think that 'Corinthian favour' was no more than the self-interest of Corinthian shippers who bought whatever pots they could sell most profitably. Chalcis is included on the strength of the so-called 'Chalcidian' vases, of which the great majority are known to have been found in Italy and none east of the Adriatic. D. is not always fair to views other than his own and does not suggest (p. 252, n. 1) that the dissenting opinion that 'Chalcidian' was made in Italy, whether Greek or Etruscan, is widely held. To his argument that it cannot be Etruscan because the Italo-Corinthian and bucchero which are certainly Etruscan have a different distribution, it could be replied that those wares are in general considerably earlier and the course of Etruscan trade might have changed. On trade with Carthage and between the colonies he is prudently cautious.

Chapter IX, on the other hand, is an admirable account of the art of Greek Italy and Sicily to the end of the archaic period, and it includes much original research. Colonial art does not begin till near the end of the seventh century

and takes slightly different courses in the two regions. Sicily, the more backward, followed, if intermittently, the fashions of Corinth and the Peloponnese and later of Athens, and at the end of the sixth century there is some East Greek influence; so there is not so much a steady development as progress by sudden steps. But this conservative provincialism is modified sometimes by an eclectic unorthodoxy and occasionally (as in some of the Selinus metopes and a group of terracottas) by an unusual harshness, so that one may speak of a Sicilian school in which Selinus shows the most originality. The highest form of Sicilian art was architecture with its decoration in terra-cotta and stone: there was besides a large production of terra-cotta figurines, but painted pottery and bronzes were little made. For Italy the material is scarce till the middle of the sixth century, but its impression is more original. At Tarentum and Locri in particular local schools of a marked character produced bronzes from the sixth century and free sculpture in stone from the early fifth; and we must not forget the curiously vivid stone metopes from the Heraeum near Posidonia. In Italy, too, the first influence is Corinthian, but in the later sixth century some Laconian influence is visible at Tarentum and East Greek or Ionian at Locri. Architects also were daring to experiment in the late archaic period. But, as D. observes, colonial culture was late in developing.

Chapters X and XI on West Sicily contain useful information on the archaeology of Greek, Phoenician, and Elymian settlements and some less useful historical reconstruction. Chapter XII takes up the history of South Italy from the mid sixth to the early fifth century; as D. remarks, 'scarcely an event is not touched with a romantic or miraculous colour'. Chapters XIII and XIV discuss at length the great tyrants Hippocrates and Gelon, and in particular their military campaigns, on which D. makes some good suggestions. There is no general summary, which is a pity, as this is not an easy book.

In a work of this length discrepancies

are hard to avoid. Here is a sample. How are we justified in assuming, independently of the traditional chronology, that on inland sites the earliest finds should not go back to the foundation of the settlement (p. 100) but that on coastal sites they should (pp. 454-5)? Why should the poor artistic quality of most Corinthian aryballooi found in the west leave no doubt that they were exported from Corinth filled with perfume and fine oils (pp. 227 and 243), when other Corinthian pots artistically quite as poor were exported solely for their own merits (pp. 243 last line—*kotylai*, 261-3)? Were the antecedents of the Locrians respectable (pp. 36-7) or doubtful (p. 69)?

More misleading are the numerous assumptions that are stated as more or less certain facts. pp. 81, 188, 250, 355: how far can we rely on Herodotus for the details of Agariste's wooing? p. 214: is Athenaeus (or Timaeus) sufficient authority for asserting that Sybaris is known to have absorbed all its own production? p. 229: is there in the Milesian colonies any Rhodian pottery earlier than the Corinthian? p. 242: if the development of a Corinthianizing style at Athens proves close relations between Corinth and Athens, do not the other contemporary Corinthianizing styles prove close relations also between Corinth and most Greek cities that made painted pottery? p. 242: why is it reasonably certain that some Corinthian potters migrated to Athens? p. 246: how do the large denominations of early coinage show that it was issued for large-scale overseas transactions? p. 259: did not every Greek town have smiths and carpenters, and what is the justification for calling their industries 'heavy'? p. 265: why may pottery be taken as typical of other industries whose products have perished? p. 267 (cf. pp. 112 and 318): is Pausanias' ascription of a statue to Daedalus proof that it was Cretan? pp. 301, 330, 341: can we speak confidently of Stesichorus and his *Geryoneis*? To these and similar questions D. may have the answers, but he should give the reasons for his questionable assertions.

Pottery naturally forms a large part of the archaeological material collected in this book. On Corinthian and Attic, which here are much the most important, D.'s knowledge is deep and reliable. A minor point on which my inquiry may be ignorant is whether the Protocorinthian pottery assigned to a factory in Cumae was not in fact made in Corinth. I am less confident about D.'s identifications of Cretan, Cycladic, and Argive vases and of the Subgeometric from native sites: these are classes of pottery of which little is known, and a short account of the Subgeometric would have been particularly useful. East Greek I have already mentioned. I do not think that Rhodian is distinctive among East Greek clays (p. 238); and there are several items on which I disagree in Appendix II, which is a comprehensive list of East Greek imports. In particular I think that D. is too bold in identifying his plain East Greek wares, though he is not one of those students of Italian archaeology who believe that any archaic pot deco-

rated with simple bands of paint may be called Ionian. In excuse of D. it should be said that fortune has been against him. Most of his work in the museums of south Italy and Sicily was done in 1934-5 before he had a first-hand general knowledge of all the relevant classes of Greek pottery, and he has not been able to return and revise his opinions on the spot.

This is a disappointing book, invaluable as a collection of material, but of unequal merit in its use of that material. Many of the general conclusions are sound, but the detailed argument is sometimes spoilt by shallowness or prejudice, so that the reader has constantly to be on his guard. Even so *The Western Greeks* is likely to be a standard work on its subject for many years.

The maps and plans are unnecessarily poor, the proof-reading excellent, the index good.

R. M. COOK.

Museum of Classical Archaeology,
Cambridge.

PRIVATE LIFE IN ANCIENT DELOS

Waldemar DÉONNA: *La Vie privée des Déliens*. (École Française d'Athènes: Travaux et Mémoires, Fasc. VII.) Pp. 200. Paris: de Boccard, 1948. Paper.

THE author of this work began his investigations of the furniture (in the widest sense) of ancient Delos as far back as 1905, when he was a foreign member of the École Française d'Athènes. His researches remained unpublished for many years, then were resumed in 1931-2. The main results of his work are given in the monumental *Le Mobilier délien* (1938), fasc. xviii of the School's *Exploration archéologique de Délos*, to which was added a volume of plates. It was first intended that the present work should be an integral part of that work, but later it was decided to leave to the major work its purely descriptive character. That the present volume appears a decade later is no doubt attributable to the exigencies of the late war and its aftermath.

In the foreword the author observes that the book is not intended to give a complete and detailed account of the industrial and economic life of Delos but is to be regarded as a general introduction and a companion volume to which the readers of *Le Mobilier délien* may refer. This design is admirably executed. Beginning with a preliminary survey of the history of Delos, the author proceeds to review the various aspects of the administration, religious and political, of Apollo's island, and of the commercial activities of the cosmopolitan residents and sojourners found there from the middle of the third century B.C., regard being had always to the details of local archaeological evidence.

Given the smallness and sterility of the sacred island, and its lack of naval defence, it was bound to pass into the suzerainty or the patronage of whatever city-state, or Hellenistic prince, or league, could make good a claim, until

may be
should
against
seums
one in
-hand
evant
e has
se his

, in-
l, but
that
nclu-
argu-
ness
r has
en so
be a
many

arilily
the

K.

erves
ve a
the
but
duc-
which
may
ex-
ary
the
ous
ous
ous
l of
no-
ind
en-
to
vi-

of
val
the
ver
or
til

the time when the shadow of Rome fell across the Athenian colony, established in 166 B.C. on the collapse of Rhodian power. D. accepts the questionable view that free Delos (314-166) enjoyed a status of neutrality. The early part of the second century B.C. saw the beginning of the transformation of Delos into a transmarine exchange, the importance of which was increased by the destruction of Corinth. D. rightly observes that the period of greatest prosperity lay between about 110 and 88, when the sack of the island by the troops of Mithridates VI of Pontus inaugurated the decline which was precipitated by the attack of the pirates in 69. A shrunken population lingered till Imperial times.

In spite of devastation, decay, and centuries of total neglect, there has emerged a comparatively rich yield from temples, warehouses, and especially dwelling-houses, which clustered thickest in the region of the theatre. No attempt was made in this little island to delimit domestic buildings; development at one period was too rapid even if town-planners had been forthcoming. The objects mentioned in this work range in date from pre-Hellenic times to the early Christian centuries. It is clear from inscriptional evidence that the main imports were wheat, oil, wood, pitch; marble, too, and at a late period, slaves. The imported goods were intended mostly for immediate re-export. For a while Delos was 'the common mart of Greece', κοινὸν Ἑλλήνων ἐμπόριον (Pausanias). There must have been in this peak period of pros-

perity a large local consumption. Indeed, some merchants combined wholesale and retail trade.

D. reviews the centres of commerce (docks, agoras, warehouses, shops); the vestigial evidence of numerous trades and occupations; the semi-religious guilds of shipmasters, merchants, and middlemen (*έγδοχεῖς*), Levantine, Greek, and Roman; the properties of the god in leased houses and lands, and precious objects (with the temple inventories thereof); and the provenance, insular and continental, of innumerable objects, notably sculptural and fictile remains which have been partly dispersed in various museums. The local museum houses a large collection of lamps, and another and fine collection of earthenware braziers. There appears to have been a local preference for vessels ornamented with relief work.

It is not surprising that in the field of domestic ornamentation, marine objects predominate; the dolphin, as D. says, appears everywhere at Delos. And the dedicatory formula, *ἐκ πολλῶν καὶ μεγάλων κινδύνων*, tells its own tale. D. has an interesting comment on the 'cult of the ship', and he returns to the puzzling problem of the dedicated offering in the Sanctuary (Hall) of the Bulls.

The innumerable details are set out clearly and schematically, with ample source-references below the text. This book will be particularly useful in libraries where *Exploration archéologique de Délos* is not available.

W. A. LAIDLAW.

Queen Mary College, London.

THE GREEKS AND THE SEA

Albin LESKY: *Thalatta: Der Weg der Griechen zum Meer*. Pp. 341; 38 figs. on 16 plates. Vienna: Rohrer, 1947. Half-cloth, \$5.70.

WRITTEN in Innsbruck and published in Vienna, this book provides welcome evidence that Austrian scholarship still maintains its former standards despite the appalling difficulties to which the author refers very briefly in his preface. It is regrettable that the flow of such

works to this country is not more abundant and more rapid.

The first chapter shows how the Greeks, because of their continental origin, were strangers to the sea when they first settled in the Greek peninsula and took to seafaring slowly and painfully. This theme is familiar enough, but has probably never before been illustrated by such a mass of evidence, the weightiest being from Hesiod. The

second chapter deals with Crete (somewhat irrelevantly) and Mycenae. Most emphasis is laid on the point that, while the Achaeans engaged extensively in sea-raiding, they did not feel the passionate joy in maritime adventure characteristic of the Vikings. A chapter on Oceanus is a study in mythological geography ranging over a wide field and showing how, as illumination grew, the term lost its old significance of a river encircling the world. The longest and perhaps most important chapter, which could have been improved by some system of subdivision, deals with sea-gods and sea-myths. It discusses in detail Poseidon, believed to have been originally a fresh-water god, a bewildering assortment of Old Men of the Sea, and the Nereids, as well as the attributes common to many sea-deities, such as knowledge of the future and benevolence towards man. An interesting feature of a chapter on epic poetry is the distinction drawn between the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* in their epithets and similes relating to the sea. A chapter on the lyric poets is largely a catalogue of references to the sea: Pindar with his aristocratic ideals was clearly out of sympathy with seafaring, but it may be doubted whether the extant remains of the others are sufficient in volume to be adequately representative of their feelings on a subject mentioned incidentally. The seventh chapter on 'Meeresnähe der klassischen Hochzeit' begins with a few pages on the creation of Athenian sea-power by Themistocles and its expansion by Pericles, but most of it is concerned with the Attic tragedians, notably with their use of sea metaphors. Euripides is shown to be a forerunner of the Hellenistic age in picturing for the first time most seafarers enjoying happy voyages over calm seas. A final chapter treats the evidence of the Hellenistic period and after, especially that of Apollonius Rhodius, the bucolic poets, New Comedy, and the *Anthology*.

A prodigious amount of labour has been devoted to this book, which displays on every page the learning of its author. He seems to be equally at home in dealing with every branch of Greek

poetry, with religion, folk-lore, mythology, archaeology, philology, and he is able to derive illuminating parallels from Oriental and northern cultures. He also shows himself to be thoroughly familiar with Aegean scenery. In the earlier part of his work he keeps his eye on the interesting question whether each feature to which he draws attention was brought to Greece by the invading Greeks or was taken over by them from their dispossessed predecessors. Here, as in his treatment of other problems, he is always cautious, always ready to confess uncertainty. His last chapters demonstrate convincingly how, as the Greeks mastered the sea, they were less disposed to stress its dangers and came to regard it rather as an ally.

A feature of the book, most surprising in view of the conditions under which it was written, is its extreme leisureliness. When L. refers to a passage of an ancient author, he almost always gives a paraphrase, often a translation, where usually a bare citation would have sufficed. The work is not a popular one, and its readers are not likely to require a report of the encounter between Menelaus and Proteus in the *Odyssey* or a detailed summary of the *Rudens*. The value of translating the whole of the *Homeric Hymn to Dionysus* (59 ll.), an entire dithyramb of Bacchylides (132 ll.), and a long passage from the *Persae* (56 ll.) is questionable when none of them is discussed in detail. The book could have been improved by drastic pruning.

A more serious criticism is that the work is somewhat lacking in unity and sense of proportion. The subject is a vast one, and L. is fully justified in limiting himself to certain aspects of it, evidently those in which he is most interested. Yet the impression made upon the reader, especially by the earlier chapters, is of a series of studies connected with one another only by their relevance to the Greeks and the sea, and sometimes even the one or the other of these is temporarily forgotten. It is indefensible in a work dealing with the influence of the sea on the Greeks to

pay so little attention to Athenian sea-power, naval and commercial, and none to Hellenistic developments in ship-building. There is no ναυτικὸς ὄχλος, no Phormio, no ῥυπαπᾶ, no Demetrius Poliorcetes, no Hieron with his huge *Syracosia*. The author apparently feels little interest in the evidence of prose-writers, with the strange exceptions of Alciphron, Longus, and Aristaenetus: he cites Goethe more frequently than Herodotus, and apart from a few references to Plato and Aristotle, fourth-century prose is entirely ignored. There is not a single reference to any of the Attic orators. These criticisms, how-

ever, perhaps amount only to a complaint that the book should have borne a different title.

The copious notes direct our attention to the astonishing amount of work published in German between 1939 and 1943, of which very little is known in this country. The illustrations, especially those of 'Fischmänner' and 'Meerdrachenmänner', are attractive, though the Exekias cup of Dionysus on his ship is poorly reproduced. I noticed very few misprints, but there are many omissions in the index.

H. D. WESTLAKE.

University of Manchester.

PERICLES

A. R. BURN: *Pericles and Athens*. Pp. xxv+253. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1948. Cloth, 5s. net.

Few men ever devoted their lives to the service of a State and an ideal so completely as Pericles. Even fewer have been able to impress their personality so thoroughly on the history of their age. The phrase 'Periclean Athens' is not a catchpenny label; it expresses a fact, and an important fact. The subject of this book is therefore one which conforms admirably with the fundamental conception of the series in which it appears.

The character of this series virtually precludes original contributions to such a topic, for at this stage of sophistification in the study of ancient history they could only be based on elaborate technical discussions. But what could be, and has been, done is to make available to the general reader the results of much recent research which is buried in the relative obscurity of learned journals. Thus Mr. Burn includes material drawn from the American excavations in the Agora (pp. 6, 119, 121, 140-2), from the evidence of inscriptions (pp. 86-9, 192-3) and especially the tribute-lists (pp. 98, 102, 109), and from the work of the historians of art (e.g. pp. 27-8). Nor is prosopography neglected, and the genealogies at the end of the book are a useful supplement, emphasizing as they do the close social connexions of the

men who for long led even democratic Athens.

It was naturally important that such a book should be vivid and readable, and many anecdotes from Plutarch and other sources are therefore cited at length, not always with the critical reserve that they would seem to demand (e.g. pp. 43 and 93, Pericles and Elpinice; p. 113, the bribery of Pleistoanax; pp. 128 and 191, Pericles and Alcibiades). Another method used to enliven the text is the use of modern analogies. Thus Pericles becomes the first liberal in history (p. 89), a Montgomery in his thrift of human life (p. 83); Hippias as archon is the Duce taking his turn as official head of the State (p. 6); Sparta is national-socialist (p. 46); and Athens suffers from immigration problems similar to those of the U.S.A. (p. 92). The device is legitimate if used with care but its dangers are obvious. It is only just to say that in many cases these bold parallels are safeguarded by the use of inverted commas or by more explicit qualifications.

It was necessary that many controversial points of detail should be passed over without discussion. Some of these are familiar friends: the Peace of Callias (though this is briefly defended in a footnote), the recall of Cimon in 457 B.C., Pericles' failure to become general in 444 B.C., and the date of 'Old Oligarch'. All these points are obviously disputable,

but this was not the place to dispute them.

Of greater interest, perhaps, are the broader issues of interpretation. Mr. Burn is not one of those who regard Pericles' introduction of pay for jurors as the device of a demagogue; he believes it to have been a necessary condition of the working of full democracy. On the other hand, he does consider that the building-programme had some connexion with post-war unemployment, though admitting it also as an essential part of the Periclean ideal. In the sphere of foreign policy he underlines the impact of the Egyptian disaster (cf. especially pp. 115 and 178), and maintains that the dualism sanctified by the Thirty Years' Peace was acceptable to Pericles, who did not come to believe another clash with Sparta inevitable until 435 B.C. or even later. He rejects the theory that Pericles forced on the war from personal motives, though suggesting the possibility that after seeing war to be inevitable he accelerated its outbreak while he was there to lead—and to restrain. In this context the author offers the view that the truculent speech of the Athenians at Sparta may have been

deliberately intended to force the issue—a possibility which perhaps deserves more elaborate justification elsewhere. Mr. Burn finds the *ἀληθεστάτη πρόφασις* of the war in the west—Peloponnesian fear of an Athenian blockade of their corn-supply, and Athenian fear of the Sicilian war-potential. The general impression is of an atmosphere of mutual distrust in which 'incidents' precipitate a clash which was willed by neither side.

It would not be proper to conclude without indicating the wide range of topics woven into the texture of the main narrative. There are sketches of the Athenian constitution and political groupings, of rival political ideals (illustrated by 'Old Oligarch' and the Funeral Oration), of the growth of Athenian imperialism, of Ionian thought and the sophistic movement, and of the art and architecture of the Periclean Age. The value of writing such a book for the general reader cannot be doubted, and this value is enhanced by the lamentable fact, emphasized by Mr. Burn's bibliography, that in the last sixty years only two lives of Pericles have appeared in English.

A. J. HOLLADAY.

All Souls College, Oxford.

THE ATTIC CALENDAR

W. KENDRICK PRITCHETT and O. NEUGEBAUER: *The Calendars of Athens*. Pp. xii + 115. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press (for the American School of Classical Studies at Athens), 1948. Cloth, \$5.

An adequate review of this important book would require not only a knowledge of ancient astronomy equal to Dr. Neugebauer's and of the evidence for the nature of the Attic calendar equal to Dr. Pritchett's (neither of which is to be found in more than half a dozen scholars all told), but a re-examination of much of that evidence on the stones themselves. I will only attempt here to state their main conclusions and the methods by which they have reached them.

The two immediately most important conclusions are, I think, these: first,

that Aristotle's statement (*Aθην.* 43. 2) that the first four prytanies of the year consisted each of 36 days and the last six of 35 (with the same principle, we must suppose, applied, *mutatis mutandis*, to intercalary years) cannot be ignored, as recent studies have ignored it, and that the evidence for his day, 341/0 to 307/6 B.C., is consistent with it; and that the evidence for the periods of the twelve *phylae* and the thirteen *phylae* is also consistent with that principle, and that it may well have applied as well to those years of the fifth century when the boule and its prytanies held office for a solar year. Secondly, the authors maintain, it is not necessary to suppose that the Athenians ever carried their love of a complicated calendar so far as to use both backward count and forward count of days in the last third

of the month, at the same time and in the same language (so that for a time *δευτέρα μετ' εἰκάδας* might mean either the 22nd or the 29th); and that the evidence is consistent with the view that the backward count only was used. If they have proved their case, the result is obviously of great value, for it takes contemporary evidence into account, and provides a simpler solution than the old; and they are well aware of the difficulties of their task. The first and most obvious of these is the paucity of the evidence: the lacunae in the inscriptions are many, and even when (as often) the number of letter-spaces in the missing part is known or can be reasonably conjectured, we are faced with several possibilities of restoration—some vital words, as *πρώτη*, *δύδοη*, *ἐνάτη*, have the same number of letters; there were variations in spelling and still more in writing, two letters in one letter-space and spaces left vacant, and so forth; and occasionally an error by the stone-cutter (or by the writer of his 'copy') must be assumed in order to restore. Examples enough of all these things can be found for certain on inscriptions; but they make it disturbingly easy to restore according to a given theory. These difficulties (or should we call them facilities?) are to be found in the way of any theory; but Pritchett and Neugebauer have a new one as well, or rather, they lay more stress on an old one than their immediate predecessors have done; and this is a third important novelty in this book. It is widely known that on certain inscriptions, of the second century B.C., we have, besides the prytany date, *two* monthly dates, one called *καὶ θεόν* (the astronomical date as calculated), the other, occasionally, *καὶ ἄρχοντα*. The authors note that the former is normally in agreement with the proper prytany date (which shows that prytany periods did not vary) and that it is always in advance of the latter; that is, that some days have been intercalated by the archon, though the civil year was not thereby lengthened, days being dropped, it must be supposed, in Scirophorian, to ensure that the new year began with a

new moon on Hecatombaion 1st. They go on from this to the natural assumption that on all our other inscriptions the monthly date is a date *καὶ ἄρχοντα*, and that intercalation of days was common and not determined by any system. This gives great flexibility to their argument; for an equation of a monthly date with a prytany date, which at first sight appears either to support a different theory (e.g. the forward count, or that Aristotle is wrong, or that a particular year is intercalary), or to be a mistake, may now, by the assumption of a previous intercalation of days in a civil month, be made consistent with their own. There is nothing improper in this: intercalation of days is testified for certain, and we know from Aristophanes that the civil calendar was liable to get out of line with the moon. The probability that this happened fairly often, and would be reflected in the calendar-equations of the inscriptions, is rightly taken into account; still, it adds to the 'facilities'. The only gap in the authors' argument that I find is some explanation of the reason for these intercalations of a few days here and there; for *a priori* one would have expected them to be made in order to correct anomalies due to faulty astronomical observation rather than to create them; and that it would have mattered less if the prytanies (in the period of the twelve phylæ) rather than the civil and religious months had got out of line with astronomy. The juggling with the calendar in order to please Demetrius Poliorcetes is no sort of parallel.

There is much else of interest and importance in this book: for example, a reconsideration of the basis of calculation of principal and interest in *I.G. i.² 324* ('our argument is that if a certain method is used for computing interest, a similar one must be employed for computing the principal when only the interest is preserved. The maximum error permitted in any given method of computing interest should likewise be allowed in computing the principal'); the virtual abolition from the Athenian calendar of the Metonic cycle, and the suggestion that the solar prytany-year

of the fifth century was uniformly of 366 days (the first six prytanies being of 37 days each, the last four of 36) and that it may have been introduced before 433 B.C.; no alternation of full and hollow months; and the statement that Greek astronomers of the fifth and fourth centuries were not capable of as exact measurements of the luni-solar year as has generally been assumed. On this last matter the non-expert reader would have welcomed a longer statement.

The book, though clearly written, is not easy to read, for in order to follow the argument it is necessary to have *I.G.* i and ii and several volumes of *Hesperia* open before one, especially as the lines of inscriptions which are quoted are not numbered. There are some misprints, one or two of them disturbing: 'Prytany [V]' for 'Prytany [VI]' at the top of p. 71, and on p. 87 a repetition of a line (from *Prytanis*,

no. 64) in place of the line intended. I cannot understand the restoration δευτέραι (in the inscription, *Hesp.* iii (1934), p. 3) to mean 22nd of the month, on p. 53. This last carries with it the further restoration, ἡμερολεγόν, for which the authors suggest a new and not very convincing interpretation. I also find difficulty in the argument that the Athenians began the month on the evening following the first observation of the new moon (contrary to Dinsmoor's view that it began after the astronomical conjunction): what happened when the archon intercalated several days and did not excise others in the same month?

Almost all recent work on the Athenian calendar and chronology has been done in America. This book is a most welcome (and disturbing) addition.

A. W. GOMME.

University of Glasgow.

ALEXANDER

W. W. TARN: *Alexander the Great*, Vol. I (Narrative): pp. xi + 161; map. Vol. II (Sources and Studies): pp. xiii + 477; map. Cambridge: University Press, 1948. Cloth, 10s. 6d. and 30s. net.

ALL scholars will welcome this work, in which one of the greatest authorities on the Hellenistic world sets out his interpretation of its creator, Alexander, and puts on record the researches on which his interpretation is based. The first volume is substantially the same as Dr. Tarn's chapters on Alexander in the *Cambridge Ancient History*, revised and brought up to date. The second and larger volume is a closely packed summary of his work over many years, in which he analyses the evidence and justifies his conclusions.

The second volume opens with a detailed discussion of the sources, and in particular of the much inflated figure of Cleitarchus. Dr. Tarn proves first that he wrote after Patroclus had published the results of his exploration of the Caspian and is therefore not a first-hand authority, and secondly that he was not the main source of Diodorus, and that in fact we know very little about him.

THE GREAT

Diodorus, he convincingly argues, used a variety of sources, one of which at any rate, an account of the campaign written by a Greek mercenary in Darius' service, was of high value. He also vindicates Aristobulus as a well-informed and truthful writer, worthy of the confidence which Arrian places in him.

The rest of the book is devoted to various historical problems, great and small, ranging from the Gordian Knot and the alleged massacre of the Branchidae to the organization and numbers of the Macedonian army and Alexander's relations with the Greek cities. On this last topic Dr. Tarn vigorously contests Bikerman's thesis that freedom was a privilege granted by Alexander *ex gratia* to some cities of Asia, proving on the basis of the texts that he restored their liberty, thereby implicitly admitting that it was theirs by right. But he perhaps overstates his case when he argues that juristically the freedom of a city was indestructible save by its own act. The Greeks were not jurists, and it is a mistake to deduce subtle legal theories from their words and actions. They held that it was morally wrong to 'enslave'

a city, that is, deprive it of its independence, but being realists, they did not deny that a city could be 'enslaved' and conversely 'freed' by another power. And Alexander felt himself perfectly entitled to withhold or withdraw freedom from a city which acted contrary to his wishes, either partially, as in the case of Ephesus, or wholly, as with Aspendus. Where Bikerman goes wrong is in building a juristic theory on political facts.

On the question whether the Greek cities of Asia were enrolled in the League of Corinth, Dr. Tarn admits the evidence to be inconclusive but finally comes down on the negative side. He rightly dismisses the symbolism of Ptolemy II's *pompe* as too obscure to throw any light on the question, and relies chiefly on the two arguments that the Asiatic cities took no part in the Lamian war, and that Antigonus' and Demetrius' Hellenic league did not include the Islanders, the Ionians, and the Troad, which were organized in separate confederations. Neither argument is convincing. The attitude of the Greek cities on Alexander's death was determined not by the constitutional question of whether they belonged to the League of Corinth or not, but by political considerations. The European Greeks had been free and many of them, though not all, resented the League of Corinth as an instrument of Macedonian domination. The Asiatic Greeks had been freed by Alexander and had every reason to be satisfied with their position. As for the second argument, Antigonus may well have modified Alexander's arrangements, and on any theory he must have made some changes; Chios, certainly a member of the League of Corinth under Alexander, must have been enrolled in Antigonus' Ionian league. Strangely, Dr. Tarn completely ignores the one solid piece of evidence, Alexander's decision *τῆς δὲ ουντάξεως ἀφίημι τὴν Πριηνέων πόλιν* (O.G.I.S. 1). In the first volume he explains the *ούνταξις* as 'a "contribution" . . . which officially counted as voluntary'. This cannot be right. In the first place it is inconceivable that in a

public pronouncement Alexander should have stated that he released the city of Priene from a voluntary present: it would be not only illogical but a political *gaucherie* of the first order. And in the second place *ούνταξις* does not mean a present: it is derived from *τάσσω* and means a payment assessed, and therefore obligatory, upon the payer. It was in fact used to denote the monetary contribution assessed on members of the second Athenian league. It is true that we have no evidence that in the Corinthian league there were any provisions for commutation of military or naval service, but we know too little about its constitution to deny it. If Priene was, as Dr. Tarn convincingly agrees, free, there seems to be no explanation of its *ούνταξις* save as a federal contribution to the League of Corinth.

The section entitled 'Alexander's Foundations' is rather a disappointment, since it does not contain any justification of the rather adventurous reconstruction of their constitution given in the first volume, but merely deals with their names and sites. Dr. Tarn proves with reasonable certainty that all were officially called Alexandria, the other names given by some authorities being merely nicknames, but when he goes on to argue the converse, that every city named Alexandria was founded by Alexander, he becomes somewhat dogmatic. One apparent exception, *Ἀλεξάνδρεια πρὸς τῷ Λάτμῳ τῆς Καπλας*, he elaborately explains away without even suggesting the possibility that Heraclea by Latmus in Caria may not only have been renamed Pleistarchia by Pleistarchus, but Alexandria by a later king. Alexandria Troas he claims must have been planned by Alexander, though Strabo tells us it was built by Antigonus and only acquired the name Alexandria under Lysimachus. Alexandria by Issus he also asserts must have been built by Alexander. He does not explain why it was impossible for the Successors to have founded a few cities in honour of Alexander, as Appian says Seleucus did.

The last chapters deal with matters of greater moment. Alexander's

deification, his supposed plans for world conquest, and his conception of the brotherhood of man. On the second question Dr. Tarn proves that the version of Alexander's plans which we have is a compilation of late date, when Rome was already mistress of the Mediterranean. On the third he endeavours to prove that Alexander was quite original in breaking down the barrier between Greek and barbarian. But it is doubtful whether Aristotle and Isocrates are representative of all Greek schools of thought—Xenophon does not seem to have dismissed the Persians as φύσει δοῦλοι. And it may be questioned whether Alexander's conception of unity extended beyond Macedonians and Persians: his actual policy conformed to the words of his prayer at Opis as recorded by Arrian, ὅμονοιαν τε καὶ κουωνίαν τῆς ἀρχῆς τοῖς τε Μακεδόνις καὶ Πέρσαις.

Alexander's deification was, in Dr. Tarn's view, a purely political move: at Bactra Alexander tried as part of his policy of fusion to make himself the god of all his subjects, Macedonian, Greek, and Persian; when this had failed he asked the cities of the Corinthian league to acknowledge him as a god in order to justify his interference in their internal affairs. Despite Dr. Tarn's argument that προσκύνησις in Greek eyes must have implied worship, it may be doubted whether this was the primary object of the ceremony in Alexander's mind, or its most offensive point in that of Callisthenes. Indeed, by his interpretation Dr. Tarn makes Callisthenes' attitude quite unintelligible, and he admits as much. Callisthenes was perfectly ready, and indeed willing, to call Alexander a god: his objection to προσκύνησις must then have been not that it implied that Alexander was a god, but that it was a barbarian and servile gesture. Deification of a king was not an offensive idea to the Greeks—the most liberty-loving cities, Athens and Rhodes, later readily adopted the idea—but 'slavery' to a king was, and Alexander's attempt to introduce προσκύνησις was a blunder because it was a symbol of such servitude.

The chief objection to the view that

Alexander's request for deification to the Greek cities had a political object is that there is no evidence in its favour, either for Alexander's time, or, with a single exception that proves the rule, in the subsequent relations of deified kings and Greek cities. The Athenians voted that, as Demetrius was a god, in future his ordinances should be treated as oracles, and θεωροί should be sent to him instead of πρεσβευταί (Plut. *Demetrius*, 11 and 13). This light-hearted piece of play-acting was without precedent and without consequences. In all other cases the cities keep worship of kings and political relations with kings in completely separate compartments. For participation in royal worship they send θεωροί, for diplomatic purposes πρεσβευταί; they worship them as gods but in political communications address them as kings; τὰ βασιλικά are a separate category on the agenda of the assembly from τὰ ιερά; the commands of kings are προστάγματα, not χρηματοί. The kings likewise use the ordinary terms of diplomatic language in their communications to the cities. There is nothing in any of the documents to suggest that the kings claimed any political authority as gods, or that the cities accorded them any, or indeed regarded deification as anything but an expression of admiration, gratitude, or loyalty. It is surely inconceivable that the Rhodians, having vindicated their political independence against Antigonus and Demetrius at the expense of a terrible siege, should have gratuitously surrendered it to Ptolemy: but this, on the political interpretation, is what they did by instituting the cult of Soter.

Like most biographers, Dr. Tarn has fallen in love with his hero, and tends to idealize him. Deification is a case in point. If it had no political value, it must be set down as vanity, and even incipient megalomania, to ask for it: and Dr. Tarn will not admit any such weakness in Alexander. His attempt to introduce προσκύνησις seems to indicate the same trait: politically the idea was a gross blunder—Alexander should not have attempted to degrade Macedonians and Greeks in their own eyes. The fan-

tion to
ject is
avour,
with a
rule, in
l kings
voted
future
ated as
ent to
Deme-
piece
nt and
r cases
s and
com-

For
y send
pres-
but in
them
the cate-
y from
pros-
ewise
matic
to the
of the
kings
gods,
any,
any-
ation,
uncon-
g vinci-
ence
at the
have
enemy:
ution,
the cult

on has
ds to
se in
ue, it
even
r it:
such
pt to
icate
was
not
ians
fan-

tastic expenditure on Hephaestion's pyre, which Dr. Tarn passes over very lightly, is another sign of megalomania. Nor is Dr. Tarn's attempt to build up a picture of Alexander as a peaceful evangelist of the brotherhood of man

very convincing: he was training a large new army when he died. As Dr. Tarn says, 'Alexander was fortunate in his death'.

A. H. M. JONES.

University College, London.

POLITICAL THEORY

Essays in Political Theory, presented to George H. Sabine. Edited by Milton R. KONVITZ and Arthur E. MURPHY. Pp. ix+333; portrait. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1948. Cloth, 22s. net.

So wide have been Professor Sabine's interests, that the essays in this well-deserved tribute range from Solon to the present day; and only the first three directly concern readers of this journal (though I would draw the attention of students of Roman law to M. H. Fisch's paper, 'Vico on Roman Law'). In 'Cleisthenes and the Development of the Theory of Democracy at Athens' J. A. O. Larsen argues that the word *δημοκρατία* did not come into use till well on in the fifth century, and that *ἰσονομία* described the constitution of Cleisthenes. Yet he agrees, of course, that *δημοκρατία* is an easy and natural formation; and since Solon had long before used *δῆμος* in the sense which it bears in the compound, there seems little reason for delaying the formation of the latter. *Ισονομία*, I still think, means a constitutional régime, whether oligarchic or democratic, the rule of order, the contrary of the irresponsible tyranny: a term that might have been used by both parties that were opposed to Hippias. In the second paper Glenn R. Morrow discusses Plato and the Law of Nature, arguing that the foundation of the Stoic doctrine is to be found in Plato's *αὐτὸν τὸ δίκαιον* and *τὸ φύσει δίκαιον* (from which it is so short a step to *νόμος φύσεως*), in spite of his insis-

tence on legislating for the individual small state. This is a most interesting essay; yet one should ask, Why did not Plato take that step?, a question which Morrow does not answer.

The third paper, 'Aristotle on Law', by F. D. Wormuth, deals particularly with Aristotle's views on the relation of law to equity, and the inadequacy of law because of its generality. The question of 'natural' or universal law is again discussed, and with it the *ἄγραφοι νόμοι*. But in the fifth century, we read, the latter, far from being universal, 'were largely limited to the duty of piety to gods and parents, the incest taboo, and the requirements of burial of the dead. . . . The *agraphos nomos* had as its background the ancestral customs and ritualistic practices of the Greeks. It was a provincial idea, the creed of conservatives like Sophocles (. . . a conscious symbol of opposition to the new humane and rationalistic spirit represented by Euripides).' Wormuth can write thus and quote at the same time the breath-taking verses from the *O.T.* and the *Antigone*. Besides, ritualistic customs were among those most easy to define and soonest committed to writing. And what we miss in an essay with this title is some discussion of the failure of the Greeks, with their wonderful gifts for generalization in so many spheres and their positive achievements in this one, to develop a theoretical jurisprudence.

I may add that the whole volume is of very great interest.

A. W. GOMME.

University of Glasgow.

GREEK AND ROMAN CULTURE

T. J. HAARHOFF: *The Stranger at the Gate*. Pp. xii+354. Oxford: Blackwell, 1948. Cloth, 12s. 6d. net.

THIS book attempts too much. It is a survey of the harmonization of cultures in the ancient world, of the Greek attitude to barbarians, of the Roman attitude to Italy, and of the Greco-Roman synthesis in all its aspects—Mommsen and Wilamowitz in one. The treatment is unequal, and the reader wishes that H. had limited and deepened his analysis. The book is too allusive and the chronological arrangement too confused for the general public, but for the stimulation and illumination of the young university student or those reading general courses of European history it will be valuable. There is, however, a sad list of errors and omissions to irritate the advanced scholar. Professor Haarhoff, who has studied texts more deeply than articles, and living men as deeply as either, is happiest when he illustrates his theme from literature and language or from biographical detail. Perhaps his most penetrating comments concern the interaction of Rome and Hellas in the middle Republic, and his illustration of the theme in terms of the attitude of the Boer yeomanry to English civilization is not the least valuable part.

H. begins with the development of the notion of *τὸ βάρβαρον* in classical Greek literature, and shows that the doctrine of the equality of men has its roots, *pace* Dr. Tarn, in pre-Socratic philosophy; but he is not fully aware of the continuity of the 'pro-barbarian' tradition in Herodotus and Xenophon with aristocratic custom in the archaic period. Elsewhere there is too much of politics and administration, fields in which the author's knowledge is admittedly derivative, and hence his understanding is out of focus and a great deal is included that is irrelevant. The steady improvement of the Romans in provincial administration, and even their sensible toleration of local custom, are not in themselves productive of syncretism. The British did the same in India. But

H. has a clear grasp of the essential thing, that the Roman genius was to adapt and digest the best of other peoples' ways without losing its own identity and peculiar colour. He finds the secret of this resistant adaptability in the qualities summarized as *pietas* and *gravitas*. Of the latter term, one of those big Latin words that tend to defy definition, H. has something new to say: 'it implied a certain largeness of outlook . . . tenacity and strength and staying power'. He stresses the notion that the Romans felt and believed more than they reasoned, and hence could absorb other civilizations without loss of identity. Perhaps the phrase 'there is a lot in them' comes near to the essence of *gravitas*. But when H. attributes *gravitas* to a peculiarly Roman closeness to the soil, he is possibly under the influence of a modern mythology that he elsewhere combats: Greeks, too, were close to the elements of land and sea. In *gravitas* developed to excess, and turned to stiffness, H. finds the cause of the great Roman failures, political and cultural, such as Cato's 'anti-Hellenism' and the late exclusiveness towards the Italian allies. As an abstraction this may suffice, but success and excess of power are more relevant explanations of the narrow policy of the Roman aristocracy in the second century than any deep-rooted psychological tendency.

Now for particular criticism. Cato is treated in too journalistic a manner; he is exactly the man of Haarhoff's Boer-Roman equation, and deserves more serious treatment. A fantastic Caesar, the cosmopolitan version, by Shakespeare out of Mommsen, is invoked for the sake of the contrast with Augustus—the ideal of Haarhoff's *digestive* Roman—but with barely a bow to the modern source-criticism that puts this caricature out of court. Caesar's true relevance to the theme is that he was a man too woodenly true to the contemporary forms of Roman politics and in some ways too unsympathetic to innovation; perhaps his characteristic is not *magnitudo animi* but *levitas*. The notion

that king-worship was Oriental and even Persian in its origins (pp. 81 ff.) requires revision. Influenced by the political failure of the Hellenistic kingdoms, H. judges their cultural achievement superficial. Yet was not the culture of Syria as revealed in the poems of Meleager as successful a blend of two civilizations as anything in Augustan literature?

As for points of detail—there is confusion between *novi cives* and *novi homines* (139). It is hardly true that only scholars would read classical Greek in the Hellenistic world (172): who read the papyrus texts? The Italian allies were supervised, certainly by the Senate, and also by consuls when Italia was their *provincia*; in this connexion the peculiarity of the *foedus iniquum* form should be mentioned (144). Republican governors received no salary (146), but their *ornatio* should be mentioned, and so, too, in any account of Republican administration the persistent attempts to

produce an effective extortion law. Aqueducts in North Africa were not for irrigation (114). In Roman colonies natives did not normally sit on the local councils from the foundation (159). The Lex Licinia Mucia did not forbid Latins to acquire the citizenship by residence (146); that privilege had been lost earlier. The bequests of Hellenistic kingdoms to Rome were due to something more sinister than a recognition of Roman prestige (190). Not freedmen but their sons gained the right to vote (228).

Despite these weaknesses, due to the vast field that is covered, Professor Haarhoff succeeds in delineating the Roman achievement of transforming what Rome assimilated, and his illustrations from his own nation's experience in similar circumstances are very illuminating, whether one accepts the much invoked 'philosophy of the whole' or not.

A. N. SHERWIN-WHITE.

St. John's College, Oxford.

EGYPT

H. Idris BELL: *Egypt from Alexander the Great to the Arab Conquest*. Pp. vii + 168. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1948. Cloth, 10s. net.

In this book Sir Harold Bell publishes the Gregynog lectures delivered at Aberystwyth in 1946: some 130 small pages of text and 40 pages of notes covering the history of Egypt from Alexander the Great to Justinian. Care in selection and compression of material, thoroughness in treatment, the author's intimate acquaintance with a myriad detailed investigations, above all his authority and up-to-dateness, make this work easily the best short survey of its subject since Wilcken's *Grundzüge*, published nearly forty years ago. It is addressed in the first place to the general and non-specialist reader, and no more reliable or competent guide-book could be put into his hands. But professional historians will also find it useful as a *mise au point* and a notable bibliography of recent theories. Above all, I venture to think, the scholar interested narrowly in literary texts

should be grateful for this account of the milieu in Egypt which cherished and copied those texts which still survive.

The lecture form has dictated the division of the book into four chapters, of which the first is an introductory description of the peculiarities of Egypt in history, geography, and climate, of the nature and manufacture of papyrus, the story of papyrus discoveries, and the method by which the papyrologist works. (Incidentally perhaps a footnote may be allowed here to the allusion on p. 18 to the large find of 1940: this consists of books of Origen, and a preliminary account of them by O. Gueraud may be read in the *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions*, cxxxi (1946), pp. 85–108.) The author insists admirably on the limitations of documentary papyrus evidence—the difficulty of generalizing from Egypt to countries outside, haphazard distribution in both time and place inside Egypt of the surviving documents, and the delusion that a document is necessarily an impartial witness. Thereafter three chapters, Ptolemaic, Roman,

Byzantine, treat of the administrative, economic, and social history of Egypt within its political framework. The account is crisp and straightforward, and the pages in which the writer tilts at established views (e.g. the Macedonians, and later the Romans, as *Herrenvolk*; his thesis that Sarapis was intended for export; the origin of monasticism) are models of clear and fair statement, in which the case to be attacked is sympathetically expounded before the author charges home.

The book's sub-title is 'a study in the diffusion and decay of Hellenism'. From this point of view, too, there is much of interest, though space is limited and the attention given to political history with its inevitable period divisions tends to get in the way. But a merit of the book is the way in which it suggests questions to the reader. The influence of Egyptian climate and geography on Egyptian character is considered: must it not also have affected profoundly the outlook of the Hellenic immigrant? How far was the settler at Oxyrhynchus or at Soknopaiu Nesus, on the fringe of the desert, and far from the sea, conscious of isolation from Hellas?

When did the flow of immigrants dry up, and was there not then an increased sense of isolation? The fortunes of the Greek language, the *koine*, are perhaps touched on one-sidedly: for the *koine* was not a one-way bridge, but a powerful channel through which the Orient reacted on its conquerors, and the spirit of the Middle Ages is first seen in the astrological and occult lore, written down in Greek under the protection of Hermes, at the very time of Alexandrian triumphs in philology and science. Why, indeed, did the savants of Alexandria have relatively so slight an influence in their adopted country—as well in the text of Homer as in science?

The accuracy of the book is guaranteed by its author's name. P. 91, there is at any rate a case for thinking that the date of the establishment of the Alexandrian and municipal senates was not A.D. 202 but 200, when Severus is known to have been in Egypt (cf. Wilcken in *Archiv*, vii. 85). I have noted only one misprint: on p. 143, Giallani should be Giabbani.

E. G. TURNER.

University College, London.

TRAJAN'S PARTHIAN WAR

F. A. LEPPER: *Trajan's Parthian War*. Pp. xv+224; map. London: Oxford University Press, 1948. Cloth, 15s. net.

THIS monograph is a model of historical method. The author starts with a careful analysis of the meagre sources, in which he not only assesses the value of the authors who deal with his subject and discusses the sources from which they drew their information, but also traces the channels whereby the scanty remnants which survive from them have come down to us—a matter of some importance, since the epitomes and excerpts which we possess were made with special ends in view, and give a distorted picture of the books from which they were drawn.

He next tackles the chronology of the war. Here he adds an unnecessary complication to a problem which is complicated enough in itself by tracing its

historical development. When, as in this case, new pieces of evidence have been unearthed which definitely settle certain points, it is not very profitable to discuss earlier hypotheses which have been disproved by them. Mr. Lepper would have arrived more expeditiously and more clearly at his results by setting out the available evidence and drawing his own conclusions. Apart from this his treatment is admirable both for its method and for its caution: he makes due allowance for the ambiguity of what seems the clearest evidence—even military diplomas, he points out, are not fool-proof, since occasionally the imperial titulature does not correspond with the day, month, and consular date.

His conclusions are that Trajan left Rome in the autumn of 113, probably on 27 October; that he received the title of Optimus, which marked the sub-

ts dry
n in-
rtunes
koine,
dely:
ridge,
which
erors,
is first
t lone,
e pro-
me of
y and
nts of
ht an
try—
as in
aran-
there
that
Alex-
s not
own
en in
y one
ld be
ER.

as in
have
settle
table
have
upper
ously
etting
wing
this
or its
akes
what
mili-
not
im-
pond
late.
left
ably
title
sub-

mission of Armenia, in the autumn of 114; that the earthquake at Antioch, where Trajan was wintering, occurred on 13 December 115 (Malalas' date is accepted after a careful evaluation of his reliability on such a question); and that he was granted the title of Parthicus, which celebrated the fall of Batnae and Nisibis, i.e. the final subjugation of Mesopotamia, on 20 February 116 (here the *Fasti Ostienses* are decisive).

From the time-table of the war based on these key dates it appears that Trajan, after rapidly overrunning Armenia and Mesopotamia, paused a long while before launching his attack on Ctesiphon. From this Mr. Lepper infers that Trajan's original intention was to annex this area only, which he consolidated with deliberation, and that the attack on Ctesiphon was originally planned merely as a demonstration to establish Roman prestige. In the second section of the book he examines the strategic topography of the eastern frontier and argues that the line which Trajan established in the first stage of the campaign, the southern sector of which would have coincided closely with the actual frontier held from Severus to Julian, was strategically sound. Trajan's motive was, therefore, he argues in the third section, to establish a sound military frontier, and not, as some modern authors have tried to prove, to gain control of trade routes, nor, as Dio would have it, *δόξης ἐπιθυμία*. It was only in the last few months of his life that Trajan's judgement went astray, and misled by his easy success he annexed all Babylonia down to the Persian Gulf; and this failure of judgement is attributed—with the support of a diagnosis by the Nuffield Professor of Clinical Medicine—to the high blood-pressure which soon caused his death.

The *optimus princeps* is thus cleared—except for his last few months, when he was a sick man—of the charge of megalomania: Dio's verdict, which is probably derived from Arrian, represents only the official view under Hadrian, who, having abandoned even the useful parts of Trajan's conquests was

bound to depreciate the whole campaign. The thesis is convincingly argued and may well be true, but it may be doubted whether Trajan's original plan was as sane as Mr. Lepper represents it. Mesopotamia was no doubt financially worth annexing, and was defensible; the line of the Khabur and the Jebel Sinjar forms an excellent military frontier, and the Hellenistic population of the cities welcomed Roman rule and proved very loyal subjects. Armenia, however, was a very different proposition. A poor country, it is a tangled mass of mountains, difficult to control and with no definite frontier to the south-east: and its population was linked by culture and tradition with Persia. Armenia was bound to be a heavy liability to the empire, if annexed. On the other hand, even under Parthian control, it was never a threat to Rome; neither the Parthians, nor the Persians after them, were so wrong-headed as to try to send an invading army through the Armenian mountains instead of by the easy route through Mesopotamia. As subsequent experience proved, Mesopotamia could be held without control of Armenia, but only at the cost of embittering relations with Parthia. The sensible policy was that of the Flavians and of Hadrian, to rest content with the Euphrates frontier, which, if militarily not particularly strong, was acceptable to both sides.

Pompey was the evil genius of Rome's eastern policy. By accepting Tigranes' submission he established a claim to suzerainty over Armenia from which it was difficult to retreat without loss of face. Nero had at last abandoned Armenia save for the formality that the Parthian nominee must receive his crown from the Roman emperor. To vindicate this barren point of honour Trajan embarked on an expensive campaign, which, if successful, would have burdened the empire with a profitless and troublesome province. *Δόξης ἐπιθυμία* is perhaps the true verdict after all.

A. H. M. JONES.

University College, London.

ROMAN SWITZERLAND

Felix STAHELIN: *Die Schweiz in römischer Zeit*, 3rd edition. Pp. xviii + 659; 205 figs., map, 3 plans. Basle: Schwabe, 1948. Cloth, 30 Sw. fr.

A NEW edition of Dr. Staehelin's admirable work is a notable affair for students of the Roman West and the encomiums of Collingwood and Mr. Syme, in *J.R.S.*, 1928, p. 239 and 1931, p. 301, respectively, more than hold good for the present enlarged volume.

The book is divided into two sections, the first being historical and the second a description of the culture of Roman Switzerland. Though Staehelin deals with such a small part of the Roman Empire and, moreover, with an area which had then no political unity, he makes the reader share his unerring sense that its story is a great one. This is partly due to his skill in conveying the importance of this vital crossroads of invasion and empire on the highways from Italy to Germany and from Gaul to the Danube lands. The land of its south-western corner belonged to the Allobroges, so that one part of Roman Switzerland goes back to the old pre-Caesarian Province. The Helvetii, however, were the most important element in the population, for though much of the region is in Raetia and some in Italy, the lands of the Helvetii between the lakes of Geneva, Neuchâtel, and Lucerne were the most fertile in this mountainous territory and contained the most advanced communities. It is interesting to reflect with Dr. Staehelin on the fortunate lot which was ultimately in store for this tribe despite their overwhelming defeat by Caesar and the ignominious return of the survivors to a devastated, unsown land, a fate which their inherent toughness enabled them to survive.

We may briefly glance at some of the additions to the book, which has grown since the last edition by some fifty-eight pages and twenty-five illustrations, to say nothing of the many new plans which have had to be substituted to keep pace with new discoveries and which, in conjunction with the useful

topographical appendix, give some idea of the steady advance maintained by Swiss archaeology before and during the war years.

Thus, the town plan of Augusta Raurica (Augst) is taking shape; that of Aventicum (Avenches) is growing and now shows one of the chief temples and its surrounding court, while the amphitheatre has been excavated; more is known of the Helvetian oppidum at Lausanne, and the Roman vicus 3 kilometres to the west has been planned; knowledge of Gaulish and Roman Geneva is growing and the line of the old Gaulish wooden bridge across the Rhône where it leaves the lake has been established.

The famous site of Vindonissa continues to provide matter of absorbing interest, and more barracks, an arsenal, and a hospital have been explored. The date of its foundation, however, is still uncertain, but new evidence suggests that Staehelin's long stand in favour of a date about 15-13 B.C. rather than c. A.D. 9-17 may not be without justification. Finds of pottery, etc., now point to the earlier date, and Dr. Laur-Belart, the distinguished excavator, is inclined to think that one of the Drusus auxiliary forts may have been established here, though he does not think that the legion was in Switzerland so early. The discovery of a Roman ditch running for about 340 metres across the northern part of the fortress is of great interest and we must await its dating. It was filled in by the Romans, but Dr. Staehelin's view that it may go back to the time of Drusus remains to be tested.

There is a growing amount of information about the fourth-century limes along the Swiss Rhine, where up to the present thirty-seven watch-towers have been located, in addition to a number of forts of various sizes.

The section on culture deals with roads and passes, settlement, economic life, public life, art, and religion. In all these fields the strength of the romanization of the more accessible parts of Switzerland becomes increasingly clear.

There are many villas to discuss and compare, the most interesting recent work being the investigation of a large estate at Oberentfelden, with its series of workers' cottages, recalling the great Belgian villa at Anthea or that at Chiragan near Toulouse, and reminding one forcefully of how many more must await discovery in the broad lands of Gaul. Romano-Celtic temples abound; a noteworthy site is the sacred area near Petinesca, not far from Biel, with its cluster of seven small temples.

Switzerland has been surprisingly

fruitful in small but attractive objects of real artistic merit. There is an illustration (lacking, surprisingly, an indication of scale) of the beautiful gold bust of Marcus Aurelius found by chance at Aventicum in 1939. The attractive group of the wolf and twins from Aventicum still adorns the cover appropriately, for though the Alps lie across the path to Rome this book shows vividly how they were a gateway rather than a barrier.

OLWEN BROGAN.

Cambridge.

EARLY GREEK SCULPTURE

George KARO: *Greek Personality in Archaic Sculpture*. (Martin Classical Lectures, vol. xi.) Pp. xvii + 343; 32 plates. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1948. Cloth, 22s. net.

THE title seems the one relic of the author's German past, and it can scarcely have done justice even to his course of lectures at Oberlin, which he has amplified enormously for publication. The lectures, apparently, gave an evolutionary analysis of early Greek sculpture, first stressing its general originality in relation to both indigenous and Oriental predecessors, and then endeavouring to distinguish also the originality of each district in Greece. The clarity of objective still pervades what is actually a comprehensive documented handbook to Greek sculpture before 480 B.C., and dictated that it be rounded off with invaluable digressions for background. To give instances of these, the first chapter is a most sensitive and lucid exposition of the dissimilarity of Minoans and Myceneans, as revealed in their arts and buildings, and in the third there is an account of the architectural growth of the Samian Heraeum, the only primitive sanctuary excavated in its entirety and never before described as a whole.

After such preliminaries the reader approaches the main topic, of local schools in archaic sculpture, expecting the best, and gets it, but naturally on

quite a different scale, and with a growing abundance of inconclusive detail which may surfeit the non-specialist. For this the material itself is responsible. The most trustworthy body of evidence from which to deduce local styles in statues is the terra-cottas, yet these are frequently too crude to be very serviceable and there are still districts where too few have been discovered. Bronzes are of better quality as a rule and the best are liable to have been taken from place to place in ancient times; only the poorer specimens can be assumed to be local, unless great numbers have been found on the spot. Marble sculpture, if of commercial standard, may normally adhere to local traditions, whereas the progressive work is almost bound to reflect outside influences and some of it must have been made by artists from elsewhere. Moreover the marbles are often in such a battered condition as to handicap stylistic criticism. Grouping into local schools thus remains uncertain, in spite of all the research which has gone towards it; each apparent group overlaps with others, so that it loses definition if stretched to cover more than a few objects. Consequently, although this book makes a great advance, no other expert is likely to agree with all its groupings. True, a reconstruction of the artistic 'personality' or individuality of each district offers a cross-check on the groupings, but, though brilliantly thought out, it, too, cannot avoid being

hazardously subjective. Besides, I suspect that such generalizing appreciation may occasionally be vitiated by discrepancy between the archaic sculptor's intentions and his execution; however competent he might be to carve the traditional themes in the traditional way, he was liable to botch a novelty till its eventual design departed widely from what he had planned.

The illustrations are carefully sel-

ected, but of course many more are required by the argument. Unusually helpful references, however, are printed in an appendix, together with critical matter. The numbering of these notes begins afresh in each chapter, and the one real flaw in the book is that the appendix has no page-headings to identify which chapter is concerned.

A. W. LAWRENCE.

Jesus College, Cambridge.

GREEK POTTERY

Arthur LANE: *Greek Pottery*. Pp. xv + 62; 96 plates (4 in colour). London: Faber, 1948. Cloth, 21s. net.

THE need of an English book with a large number of pictures of Greek pottery has long been felt, and for this reason alone Mr. Lane's work would have been welcome. Here we have at last many good pictures of vases and details of vases beautifully reproduced. The four colour-plates are not entirely satisfactory (particularly the well-known white cup with Aphrodite on a goose) but they are much better than any colour plates that have so far been seen and in artificial light give quite a lot of the colour and texture of the original.

The selection of plates is on the whole good, although some will reasonably complain that two specimens (one Boeotian and one Attic black) inadequately represent the whole of the fourth century; Mr. Lane frankly dislikes the fourth century and therefore omits it. He takes up the logical position that pictures on pottery must not have depth and therefore decries the introduction of perspective and shading even in a restricted form: nevertheless the best of Kertch, Gnathia, and Apulian are very fine pots and in addition show a very interesting compromise between the three-dimensional picture and the rounded surface of the vase; the lifelessness, which is so apparent in drawings, however good, from fourth-century vases, often completely disappears when the vase itself is seen, because the vase shape helps the figures to arrange themselves in space.

The text consists of introductory

essays on technique, uses, ornament, and historical outline, of notes on the illustrations, and of a short bibliography. This is not the place to discuss Mr. Lane's admirable and eloquent defence of Greek pottery as pottery; it needed doing and he has done it extremely well. His notes on the different fabrics are also admirably clear and accurate, but his list of illustrations would have been much more useful if it had given museum numbers. What he has not yet given us is a history of Greek pottery which would answer the kind of questions asked, I believe, by potters. How was the pottery industry organized and of what size were the shops? Can we trace the hands of individual potters as we can trace the hands of individual painters? (Professor Beazley and Professor Bloesch have already given us some answers, but their relevant works are not quoted in the bibliography; nor, incidentally, is Professor Beazley's *Attic Red-figure Vase-painting*). Why does taste in shape and decoration vary so greatly at different times? Is there any parallel in sculpture or are the parallels that have been seen, for example by Professor Langlotz, illusory? What are the relations of volumes which make a pot pleasing or unpleasing? What principles govern the choice of flowing line uniting neck to body or sharp separation between them? What rules govern the relation of light to dark in decoration, since the black-figure lip cup and band cup seem almost equally satisfying?

It is probably unfair to ask for the answers in this book, and Mr. Lane was

justified by his wider audience in laying more emphasis on the subjects and design of the paintings than was strictly necessary in an account of Greek pottery. But the questions remain, and it is to be hoped that Mr. Lane will write

a bigger book on Greek pottery to answer them. For the moment let us rejoice in being given first-rate pictures with a good commentary.

T. B. L. WEBSTER.

University College, London.

GREEK RELIGION

M. P. NILSSON: *Greek Piety*. Translated from the Swedish by H. J. ROSE. Pp. viii + 200. Oxford, Clarendon Press (Geoffrey Cumberlege), 1948. Cloth, 15s. net.

ONE cannot be too grateful to a scholar who, after a lifetime devoted to the detailed and accurate study of a subject in all its aspects, sits back and thinks and gives to the world a book without footnotes, a short, readable survey of the conclusions to which his researches have led. It cannot be easy, and Professor Nilsson has earned our thanks. Covering a period from archaic Greece to the victory of Christianity, he seeks in 200 pages 'to set forth the religious attitude towards the world and the religious view of the life of man, as these changed with the times'. Naturally this involves making judgements on controversial matters without the 'detailed discussions and learned apparatus' which would be called for in arguing a case. Nothing could be more valuable. He has earned the right to his opinions, which, presented in this way, strike us with thought-provoking freshness. 'No one', we read, 'who has an atom of real belief treats gods as Aristophanes does.' Perhaps we had not thought so before. Nevertheless we do not demand immediate justification, but rather reflect that if this is Nilsson's opinion, perhaps our ideas about Aristophanes need overhauling. 'Paganism had no hysterical nuns, and mysticism was practised by men.' In this sort of language he denies the prevalence of sexual symbolism in the mysteries, as if, having done his share of argument, he has reached the time for vigorous and downright statement. We are sometimes pleasantly reminded of the outspokenness of Wilamowitz when, himself an elder statesman, he wrote

Der Glaube der Hellenen. It must, incidentally, reflect great credit on the translator that the language retains such an individual flavour.

Judgements are not confined to points of scholarship. Nilsson is never so obsessed by the historical point of view as to overlook the comparative value to the human spirit of various religious manifestations. Neoplatonist theology is for him 'disfigured by all manner of magic and superstition'. 'Religion', he says, 'must take account of the time, but it forgets its true nature if it tries to adopt too much of a picture of the world which originates from scientific investigation. That was the mistake which paganism made in later antiquity.' Addressed more particularly to scholars, but showing the same broad humanity of outlook, are reflections like this about the fate of a religion of the past: 'Unfriendly hands turn over its rubbish-heap, sort out the pieces of rubble, and examine them to find their origin, and that is labelled science. It is very difficult, indeed impossible, to arouse the living spirit which once throbbed in the frozen form'; or the question: 'Are we not to recognize the gift of originality possessed by Christianity and particularly by St. Paul, one of the greatest religious geniuses that ever lived?'

To quote further might suggest that the book owes its effectiveness to such separable dicta, whereas much of its value lies in its skilful construction. An introduction sums up the general characteristics of Greek religion, with particular reference to its outward form, thus providing a framework for the main account of religious views and attitudes. The rest of the work is in three sections. The first takes us to the early fifth century, disposing of this formative period in 46 pages, a brevity

justified by the familiarity of the subject and the existence of the author's earlier writings. Even the layman can get the essentials from these pages, in which every sentence tells, and what follows gives us ample compensation.

A short second section describes the crumbling of the classical framework of ideas, the reaction of individualism from the exploitation of religion by the State, the effect of Ionian science and sophistry, the significance of trials for impiety. After the Macedonian conquests the educated turned to philosophy, the uneducated to superstition. 'The ground was cleared and... a new religion must replace the old one which had withered away.'

What happened is described in the third section, in which the book becomes of absorbing interest. Religion of the late Hellenistic and Roman imperial periods has given rise to an enormous literature, to which Nilsson has contributed his share. But neither he nor anyone else has written anything like this brief and illuminating guide to the outstanding features of the age. Here is the small-scale map, the *Übersichtskarte*, of the forest among whose tangled undergrowth it is so difficult for all but a few experts to find their way. Central is the conception of *dynamis* (also called, in spite of Aristotle, *energeia*), a power at once natural and supernatural, for natural and occult potencies were not differentiated. In this concept of potency Nilsson sees 'the most marked difference between the earlier and the later religion of Greece'. With all the authority of pseudo-science it was at the back of magic, astrology, transcendental theosophy and occultism, all of which developed so remarkably from about 200 B.C. onwards. They are described in turn with the lucidity and force of a mind stored with knowledge, much of which is, for the special purpose of this book, kept under lock and key. Asking himself in conclusion why, since Greece was subject to strong

Oriental influences in the archaic period as well as in the Hellenistic, she dominated and refined them in the former but succumbed to them in the latter (and that though in the meantime she had developed her own superior culture and philosophy), Nilsson answers that what mattered was not so much the impact of actual Oriental doctrines as the fact that so many of the later representatives of Hellenism were themselves of non-Greek stock. 'If these ideas and doctrines had not found a favourable and productive soil, they would have withered. But the ground was prepared for them, owing to the thinning out and enfeeblement of the Greek element in the population.'

That some of his statements should arouse doubts is, as I have said, inevitable and salutary. On p. 26 Orphism seems to be made responsible for the change from the Homeric concept of the dead as 'lifeless, unconscious shadows' to that of punishment and blessedness after death. Was not the second a more natural and general belief than this implies? Is it so clear that Sophocles was unquestioningly pious, even approving of the horrible Athena of his *Ajax* (p. 55)? Can it be maintained that in the trials of Anaxagoras, Socrates, and others 'the accused were not charged with false doctrine but with offences against the practices of cult' (p. 79)? Is it true that 'no one distinguished between atmospheric and celestial phenomena' (p. 97)? This and the next paragraph must mean that for a Greek there was no essential distinction between *aer* and *aither*, which may be doubted. We will think further about such things, and meanwhile record our gratitude for the many lessons of this valuable book, not the least of which is the clearly drawn distinction (pp. 136 ff.) between Greek dualism, originating in Platonic idealism, and the Persian dualism from which it is nowadays fashionable to derive it.

W. K. C. GUTHRIE.

Peterhouse, Cambridge.

CONCERNING GODS AND MEN

Karl KERÉNYI: *Niobe*: Neue Studien über antike Religion und Humanität. Pp. 264; 6 plates. Zürich: Rhein-Verlag, 1948. Cloth, 19.50 Sw. fr.

THE essays which compose this book were written at various times, and profess to have in common as their central theme 'man in ancient religion' (p. 6). Their goal is apparently (p. 10) 'die Bewusstmachung dessen, was als griechische Mythologie einmal da war und in uns Menschen immer noch seine Entsprechung hat'. To be quite frank, I cannot as a rule learn from them either anything about mythology as it was or about the echoes which it may evoke in men of to-day. The studies might be of value to illustrate certain turns of central European thought; only here and there have they any genuinely Greek flavour.

The study which gives the book its title is really not easy to take seriously. Niobe or the two Niobes, whose identity the author assumes without any attempt to prove it, furnish interesting material enough for either an artistic or a mythological study; one might inquire for example what tradition Sappho was following, if any, when she said that Leto and Niobe (which one?) were dear friends of old, or ask if the sculptors and painters of antiquity show any traces of the moral difficulties which Aeschylus plainly found in the pathetic tale of the daughter of Tantalos and her children. But Kerényi wanders off (pp. 25 ff.) into an attempt to prove the bereaved mother a 'lunar' figure, because the various numbers of the children can by one course of reasoning or another be brought into relation to the days of a lunar month. She was the goddess of the dark fraction of the visible moon: 'Ihre tragische Verfehlung war, dass sie die Runde auseinanderfallen liess' (p. 33). I fail entirely to see any relation whatever to the facts in these fancies, or in the more general disquisition on 'Bild, Gestalt und Archetypus' in mythology which forms the second essay (pp. 34-52).

The third essay, 'Urmensch und

Mysterium', has a promising subject, the philosophical and quasi-philosophical speculations of antiquity as to the nature of primitive man. Such pictures as Lucretius draws and Empedokles had drawn before him Kerényi believes to have a mythological origin, a legend which is not only Greek but also Latin, witness the etymological connexion (now again in fashion) of *homo* with *humus*, according to which the first men came somehow from the ground. This is traced through various developments, including Orphic preachments; it is apparently these in particular which justify the use of the word *Mysterium* in the title.

The essay on 'Die Göttin Natur' is a kind of extended commentary, with historical introduction, on the tenth Orphic hymn. The commentary itself is useful, including an analysis of the bewildering string of epithets applied to Physis and a handy typographical device for distinguishing those which are peculiar to her in the collection, and other desirable things. In the rest of the essay I find not a little to disagree with. For instance (p. 98), when Hermes shows Odysseus the *φύων* of moly, does he do more than explain to him what it looks like when it is growing (κ 303)? Kerényi finds that *φύων* means 'die Beschaffenheit, die "Art des Seienden"' of the plant: a translation of his remarks into Homeric Greek would be interesting. In tracing Physis as a goddess from Parmenides down, he runs into several disputable interpretations, which it would take too much space to discuss, and introduces excursuses into such diverse, but not irrelevant things as Lucretius' Venus and sundry versified magical invocations.

When in the fifth essay, 'Wolf und Ziege am Lupercalienfest', he gives his undivided allegiance to the etymology which makes *lupercus* practically a synonym for *lupus* (p. 137) he makes needless difficulties which are solved with needless ingenuity. The parallel formation is *nouerca* from *noua*; now a stepmother is not a 'new' woman, but

simply new to the household into which she has married and especially the children of the former marriage. In like manner I should say that the wolfish element of the Luperci was nothing more than their ritual connexion with the very wolves which they keep off.

'Apollon-Epiphanien', the sixth essay, has not a little that is interesting to say about a variety of things, ranging from Kallimachos' hymn to the association of the god with snakes other than Python. If the author were less obsessed with the equation Apollo = Helios, the work would be sounder.

The formidable title of the seventh section, 'Das Mythologem vom zeitlosen Sein im alten Sardinien', conceals nothing more abstruse, despite many obscurities in the setting forth, than

the fact that a version of the widespread folk-tale of Rip van Winkle was located in Sardinia, as we know from Aristotle, *Physics* 218^b21 ff. The interested reader is left to discover for himself how this is brought into connexion with calendar-material. No. viii, 'Die Göttin mit der Schale', tries to explain a Roman painting in which apparently Aphrodite holds out a vessel for Dionysos to fill. The fact remains, after as before the discussion, that we do not know to what legend, if any, the artist was referring. 'Arbor intrat' (No. ix) deals with the ritual of Attis, and the book ends with No. x, 'Der Mensch in griechischer Anschauung', in which I find nothing outstandingly original, though the whole is readable.

H. J. Rose.

University of St. Andrews.

TRADITIONS

Sir Ernest BARKER: *Traditions of Civility*. Pp. viii+370, frontispiece. Cambridge: University Press, 1948. Cloth, 21s. net.

Of the eight essays in this attractive volume only the first five—'Greek Influence in English Life and Thought', 'Cycles of Change in the Island of Rhodes', 'Dante and the Last Voyage of Ulysses', 'The Connection of the Renaissance and the Reformation', 'The Education of the English Gentleman in the Sixteenth Century'—strictly touch the field of this journal, since they are, as the author says, 'all, in some sense, Greek'. But it would be churlish, even within these pages, not to mention the profoundly interesting final essays—'Oliver Cromwell and the English People', 'Paley and his Political Philosophy', 'Natural Law and the American Revolution', the last in particular, because of its ending with a comparison of Alexander and Zeno to Washington and Jefferson, who together had been similarly 'engaged in the same fundamental cause of the common law of humanity and the common rights of man under that law'.

The title of the book comes from Patmore, 'civility' being, as Johnson puts it, 'the state of being civilized':

OF CIVILITY

freedom from barbarity'. The continuity of this civility is the keynote of the work. There is much wisdom as well as learning in what is said about the nature and direction of the influence of Greek theory on our own theories of the State, economics, and education (some remarks on *scholē* being especially timely at the present day), and about the 'permeating quality of English humanism, the way it flowed into conversation, politics, and literature'. We will not dispute too heartily his caution against accepting the Greeks as absolute authorities in questions of taste and truth, while we shall not unreadily assent to his proposition that 'we can learn more from the Greeks if we observe their way of going about things than if we observe and follow the paths they actually trod'. The second essay surveys with an easy, gracious sweep the changing history of 'the island of sunshine and roses', a great commercial community with a high fame for financial probity and for 'civility' in the Hellenistic Age, a city great again under the Hospitallers in medieval times, from the Peloponnesian War down to the present, when once more the island has returned to the society of Hellas.

despread
located
ristotle,
d reader
w this is
calendar-
mit der
n paint-
te holds
ll. The
discus-
o what
ferring.
with the
ds with
hischer
nothing
e whole
ROSE.

The essay on Ulysses is purely literary and wholly charming; it takes us with the wandering hero on his long passage from Homer via Dante and Shakespeare to Tennyson and L. S. Amery, revealing him as a 'chamæleon as well as a man', who changes with the past as it changes in the vision of successive ages. The so-called Renaissance is treated in the next essay in the modern manner as something of a misnomer. That there was a great spiritual and intellectual recovery in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries admits no dispute. But, so far as concerns the classical heritage, the emphasis for the author is on continuity rather than revival, since 'the rivuli running through the ages are the essential and constant revival'. And he does well to stress the other liberating

causes of this recovery, above all else the steady, unbroken process of the growing discovery of the physical world. The last of our five essays pictures the Platonic ideal of the scholar-governor-gentleman as seen, for example, in Elyot, Starkey, Castiglione (in Hoby's translation), and Ascham, in a period of transition and of changing values, when Europe was searching for a culture.

A brief indication of the scope of these essays can give but little idea of their riches of knowledge or of the scholarly gift of interpretation with which human history and *paideia* are here illumined. They show their author to be a true humanist, himself the very pattern of 'civility'.

J. F. LOCKWOOD.

University College, London.

SHORT REVIEWS

Louis E. LORD: *A History of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens, 1882-1942*. Pp. xiv + 417; 7 portraits, 44 plates, 2 maps. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1947. Cloth, \$5.

SCHOLARS will welcome Professor Louis E. Lord's history of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens, from its beginning to its sixtieth year (1882-1942), especially those of this country who have been friendly neighbours with it in Greece. Early struggles and mistakes, both in administration and in methods of excavation, are not hidden, nor the frequent delays in publication; but the latter part of the story deals with the impressive triumphs at Corinth, Athens, and Olynthus (this last 'under the auspices of the School'), the excavations of prehistoric sites by Blegen, and the many others, which in this company must be called minor ones, in Boeotia, Locris, and elsewhere; and, as well, with the fine new buildings of the School and the Gennadeion, and the raising of vast sums in America to pay for it all—most of this associated with the chairmanship of Edward Capps. Full appendixes give lists of every excavation conducted by the School, its publications, its various funds, and directories of Trustees, members of the Managing Committee, Fellows, and Students. The book is not very easy reading, for Professor Lord jumps rather too frequently from activities of the committee in America to those of scholars in Greece, and from one excavation to another; and readers will be puzzled by some statements (e.g., as a result of epigraphical discoveries in the Agora in 1937, 'archons hitherto unknown—among them the sons of Cephalus,

participants in Plato's *Republic*—were being rescued from oblivion'). But for all that, the book is welcome.

A. W. GOMME.

University of Glasgow.

W. A. A. VAN OTTERLO: *De Ringcompositie als Opbouwprincipe in de epische Gedichten van Homerus*. (Verhandelingen der K. Nederlandsche Akademie van Wetenschappen, Afd. Letterkunde, N.R., Deel LI, No. 1.) Pp. 95. Amsterdam: Noord-Hollandsche Uitgevers Maatschappij, 1948. Paper.

THE main purpose of this work is to assemble all the instances of ring-composition in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* and to classify them according to their function: there are (1) complex annular systems where an outer ring contains one or more inner rings, and (2) single structures where the repetitive formulae either (a) mark the resumption of the main theme ('anaphoric') or (b) provide a frame for a more or less self-contained passage ('inclusive'). These terms have perhaps been sufficiently explained in reviewing van O.'s earlier studies (see *C.R.* lx. 96) which are incorporated in the present book. The instances are numerous enough to show that we have here 'consciously applied principle of composition'; though, since 'variation' is another of Homer's 'principles', the classification seems neither exact nor particularly useful; the term 'anaphoric' seems inappropriate for distinguishing one kind of repetition from another. The appendix adds an important consideration to the argument by showing that though these

circularities are practised up to the middle of the fifth century B.C., they are scarcely found at all in later writers; van O. finds only two, for example, in Apollonius Rhodius. Van O. intends later to make these researches contribute towards a solution of the Homeric problem. Clearly the athetizers and disectors have in the past regarded repetitions with undue suspicion; but one hopes that van O. will not be tempted to regard them as of themselves sufficient to guarantee genuineness—one must allow for accident and for imitation. One interesting point which emerges is the absence of the 'copulative comparison' (an 'archaic' feature) from Homer. In the elaboration of his similes Homer transcended the 'co-ordinating' syntax of his time; the lyric and tragic poets show in their comparisons a reaction towards simplicity and brevity.

J. TATE.

University of Sheffield.

A.-J. FESTUGIÈRE: *L'Hermétisme*. (Bulletin de la Société Royale des Lettres de Lund, 1947-8, I.) Pp. 58. Lund: Glerup, 1948. Paper.

THIS is a good, though short, companion to the same author's larger work, *La Révélation d'Hermès Trismégiste* (see *C.R.* lx. 91). Founded for the first time on a good text of the authors concerned, it begins, as it should, by dividing the Hermetic writings into those already handled in the above treatise and those which make up the *Corpus Hermeticum* and related documents. These are conveniently distinguished as *hermétisme populaire* and *savant* respectively. The latter again he subdivides into its two principal classes (omitting the insignificant *C.H.* xviii). The first of these, *C.H.* v, viii, ix, holds that the world of matter, although inferior to the world of mind or spirit, is yet 'pénétré par la divinité, donc beau et bon' (p. 10), while for the authors of the others, Nos. i (the *Poimandres*), iv, vi, vii, xiii, the world is something to avoid completely, with which God can have nothing to do. On these fairly familiar facts and on the general absence of a reasoned system in any of the treatises he finds his adhesion to those scholars (Bousset, W. Kroll, Cumont) who refuse to believe that there was any sect or theological school which could fairly be called Hermetic. A common attitude, by which all research is subordinated to a mystical religious experience, is indeed found in all the writings; all their authors seek a revelation, a gnosis, and those of the second and larger group are fertile in expedients to find intermediaries (especially the Logos) between God and matter; but nothing more.

Father Festugière ends by an excellent analysis of the difference between the self-centred, if incidentally benevolent and missionizing, Gnostic attitude implicit in this and all such religious developments, and Christianity with its fundamental principle of *ἀγάπη*, which is essentially non-egoistical.

University of St. Andrews.

H. J. ROSE.

Martin P. NILSSON: *Die Religion in den griechischen Zauberpapyri*. (Bulletin de la Société Royale des Lettres de Lund, 1947-8, II.) Pp. 35. Lund: Glerup, 1948. Paper.

THIS is a preliminary survey of the papyri in Preisendanz's standard collection, very useful, especially as the promised indexes are among the many desirable things hindered by the late war, for those who seek to know the relations between late Greek, or Graeco-Egyptian, magic, and the religion of those times. That magic and religion are opposed in principle the author, like everyone else who studies the question intelligently, of course recognizes; but that the one is influenced by the other, if only to the extent of borrowing the names and attributes of the gods it seeks to conjure, is also true. Magic has likewise taken over numerous scraps of liturgy, including hymns, and adapted them to its own fantastic purposes.

The investigation is statistical, asking how often the name of this or that deity appears, with other such pertinent questions. The result is briefly as follows. The classical Greek gods are still to be found, but almost exclusively those who have traditional connexions with magic or at least divination. Greek mythology is almost absent, stories from the Jewish Scriptures commoner. Some of the hymns are in the genuine Greek tradition. Monotheism is prominent, and often has a Hermetic flavour. Astrology, from the fatalism of which magic offered an escape, naturally is often mentioned. The important non-Greek elements are Egyptian and Jewish, seldom Babylonian, hardly ever Iranian, and rather surprisingly seldom Christian, considering that by the date of our papyri (mostly fourth century or later) Christianity was very strong in Egypt. The Christians themselves, on the other hand, did not scruple to resort to magic, official condemnations of it notwithstanding. I would add that the Christian magic papyri show at least a disinclination to use the more maleficent kinds of sorcery.

H. J. ROSE.

University of St. Andrews.

Sophocles: *Oedipus at Colonus*. Translated into English rhyming verse with Introduction and notes by Gilbert MURRAY. Pp. 131. London: Allen & Unwin, 1948. Cloth, 5s. net.

FOR his latest version of a Greek play Dr. Gilbert Murray has chosen Sophocles' *Oedipus Coloneus*. This play, which belongs to the dramatist's old age and is said to have been produced after his death, has been generally regarded as a masterpiece rather from a poetical than from a dramatic point of view, and Dr. Murray is no doubt right in describing it as episodic. Oedipus has been expelled from his throne at Thebes and has reached the outskirts of Athens; but the knowledge that his bones will confer benefits on the land in which they rest leads to a struggle for the possession of his person, in which Theseus, prince of Athens, is victorious over Oedipus' Theban kinsman Creon, and Oedipus himself over his son Polynices.

Oedipus is then mysteriously carried off to heaven leaving his bones to be buried at Colonus. Thus the play can hardly be said to contain a plot and its fame rests rather on its literary merit and particularly on the lyrical passages, which perhaps exceed those of any Greek play which has come down to us and to which Dr. Murray does ample justice in his renderings.

Sophocles is said to have lived at Colonus; this would account for his love of the place and its religious associations and for the picture which he gives of it in the well-known chorus (lines 668 ff.)—a rare example in Greek literature of a scenic description, since the Greeks, living in a lovely and unspoilt land, took the beauties of nature as a matter of course and did not describe them. It is sad that the site of Colonus, which can be identified in the suburbs of Athens, is now a somewhat squalid spot surrounded by mean houses.

This is the nineteenth Greek play which Dr. Murray has translated, and some 340,000 copies of the plays have been printed. No one can read a page of any of his versions without recognizing the work as that of one who is both a scholar and a poet.

EDWARD S. FORSTER.

F. L. LUCAS: *Aphrodite*. Two Verse Translations. Pp. viii+51. Cambridge: University Press, 1948. Cloth, 6s. 6d. net.

It was a happy idea to combine in this little quarto translations of the earliest and the latest classical poems about the goddess of love, which have already been published separately in limited editions by the Golden Cockerel Press; for they certainly deserve a wider public.

The Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite may be as old as the eighth century B.C. and, in the view of the translator, was perhaps composed for a festival of the goddess in some city not far from Troy, and its subject is the love of Aphrodite for Anchises, a story which also symbolizes the beauty of spring, the brevity of summer, and the coming of winter. The translator has rendered the poem most successfully in rhyming couplets in which the sense, overrunning the couplets, imparts the movement which the poem requires.

The date of the *Persegitium Veneris* is a matter of doubt, and the translator cautiously assigns it to an unknown poet who lived sometime between Hadrian and Theodosius. The later date seems nearer the mark, since the metre is beginning to be accentual and the Latin shows signs of an approach to Italian. The text has often been submitted to a good deal of unnecessary criticism and rearrangement from a desire to impose upon it a rigidly mathematical pattern and from an objection to the irregular occurrence of the famous refrain 'cras amet qui numquam amavit, quique amavit cras amet'. It is a poem of happy ecstasy addressed to the goddess of love and the spring, finishing with a bitter lament by the poet that his spring does not return. The metre, which is trochaic, is rendered in rhyming couplets of a greater length

than those used for the Homeric hymn, and is equally successful.

The Introduction and Notes tell the reader all that he requires to know of the poems and explain any points which might cause difficulty; and the form of the book is worthy of its contents.

EDWARD S. FORSTER.

Giovanni Battista CARDONA: *Polibio di Megalopoli: Storie*. Interpretate in lingua italiana. Volume primo (Libri I-II). Pp. lxxxvi+214. Naples: Edizioni Scientifiche Italiane, 1948. Paper, L. 700.

THIS first volume of a new Italian version of Polybius contains a long introduction on Polybius' life, the plan of his history, his historical method, and his account of the Achaean League. It is a sensible essay, neither novel nor very profound, but useful as an introduction to the narrative. Occasionally it arouses misgivings. I have doubts about Scipio Africanus as leader of a 'capitalist' party (p. xxxiv); on p. xlvi Philip V's Aegean policy has been telescoped into the First Macedonian War; and C. does not convince me that Hannibal's and Scipio's speeches before Ticinus are more than commonplaces. It is at least possible that the Achaean chapters of Book II were originally part of a separate work (provided one does not date their insertion in the *Historiae* after 146, with Gelzer); but the conjecture does not impose itself. Finally, xxi. 3 b. 2 is not, as C. thinks, new evidence for Mommsen's theory that Polybius served in Asia Minor in 190-189 (see Mommsen himself, *Röm. Forsch.* ii. 543); and it is inconclusive, for *reavixos* are merely 'soldiers' in Polybius (cf. Schweighaeuser, *Lex. Polyb.*, s.v.), and the fuller Polybian account in Livy xxxvii. 20 says they were veterans.

The translation is accurate and, as far as I can judge, elegant. In almost every place in Books I and II where Paton went wrong, C. is right. (But there is a serious mistranslation of xxxix. 8. 6 in the introduction, p. 1.) Unhappily the bibliography is an eyesore. It is unselective, and the author has clearly not seen some of its 133 items, the source of which I recognize from the erroneous form in which they are quoted. There is no system or consistency of reference, and misprints make it a typographer's nightmare. C. claims to have used Büttner-Wobst and Paton; but the references in his introduction are given according to a system prior even to that of Hultsch. These faults mar a useful and praiseworthy book. One hopes that they may be eliminated in subsequent volumes.

F. W. WALBANK.

University of Liverpool.

Herbert A. CAHN: *Griechische Münzen archaischer Zeit*. Pp. 32; 47 figures. Basel: Amerbach, 1947. Paper, 3.80 Sw. fr.

THIS little book is an interesting experiment and raises the problem of how best to depict Greek coins. For a numismatist, the main consideration

is the purpose which he has in mind when planning illustrations. If his concern is purely scientific—a history, a handbook, or a great catalogue (like *B.M.C.*, *Sylloge*, etc.), it is best to stick to the old method of making photographs from plaster casts. If, however, he is to present coins as works of art, he would be well advised to let his enlarged photographs be taken from originals, or from high-quality electrotype facsimiles of coins. Dr. Cahn, who gives enlarged pictures of 47 coins of the so-called archaic period, has compromised; for 21 of them (not 20 as might appear from the note on p. 28) are enlargements of plaster casts, and 26 of original coins. Had he rejected all plaster he would have lost the opportunity of making several interesting points. However, the eye should never be disturbed by photographs upon the same plate of an original coin and of a plaster cast (see Nos. 27, 28), especially when the latter is marred by air-bubble holes, for the inferiority of a cast becomes only too evident.

The selection of subjects is good; the brief introduction is interesting, and often original. Some of the dates assigned will be called in question, especially those given for Nos. 31, 34, 41, and 42, each of which seems to be placed about thirty years too early. Similarly, the Athenian piece, No. 22, is not c. 590 B.C., but a rough 'blacksmith's' coin which, as I have pointed out elsewhere (*Num. Chron.*, 1946, pp. 105, 109), may even fall fairly late in the sixth century. The book contains a short and useful bibliography, and can be recommended to historians as well as to students of ancient art making their first acquaintance with masterpieces of engraving.

CHARLES SELTMAN.

Queens' College, Cambridge.

Sir George HILL: *A History of Cyprus*. Vols. II and III: The Frankish Period, 1192–1571. Pp. xxxix + 1198; 20 plates, 2 maps. Cambridge: University Press, 1948. Cloth, £5. 5s.

In these handsome volumes Sir George Hill carries on his great work on Cyprus. Vol. i dealt with the history of the island from the earliest days to its capture by Richard Coeur-de-lion; these two cover the Frankish period; and the work is to be completed by a fourth volume on the three centuries of Turkish rule and the British occupation since 1878. A glance at the bibliography and a very short study of even a few of the elaborate footnotes will show the depth and the range of the author's researches, and the text shows his quality as a writer. The text, perhaps overburdened with detail—yet how could the story have been told very differently?—is pleasantly lightened by many of the picturesque details which make the local chronicles of Machaeras and Boustronios such agreeable reading. Two later chapters, 'The Two Churches', on the relation of the Latin Christianity of the conquering Franks and the local Orthodoxy of the Greeks, and 'The Turkish Conquest' are outstanding. The third volume ends with some good notes on the authorities and a good index.

The first volume directly concerned classical students. These two are on different lines, and in this review can receive only a brief notice, but this must not be taken as a disparagement of the great importance of the book. One minute point occurs to the present writer. On p. 15 the name Limassol, given by the English for the Greek Lemessos, is discussed, but the final *L* is left obscure. Is it not possible that it is due to sailors from Bristol, where the local dialect often adds a final *L* to words? In their mouths LEMESSO would naturally become LEMESSOL, LIMASSOL.

The volumes are beautifully printed and finely produced. As a frontispiece we have the finest photograph I have ever seen of the wonderful mountain castle of St. Hilarion.

R. M. DAWKINS.

Exeter College, Oxford.

S. E. WINBOLT: *Britain Under the Romans*. Pp. vii + 137; 8 plates, 17 figs. West Drayton: Penguin Books, 1948. Paper, 2s. net.

The regretted and premature death of S. E. Winbolt in 1944 ended a life of single-minded devotion to British archaeology and to its popularization. The present volume, a sequel to the author's other successful Pelican book, *Britain B.C.*, was first published posthumously in 1945.

Its first chapter (pp. 9–43) is a summary of the chief phases of Romano-British history; then follow ten short subject-chapters (pp. 44–136), respectively on military antiquities; roads; the towns; villas and villages; ports and coast defences; the government; religion; arts and crafts; industries and commerce; coins. Finally there are lists of 'Some Books' (containing no source-books except the *Agricola*), museums (with the surprising omission of the Hunterian at Glasgow), Roman-British place-names, and Roman Emperors; among these the 'Gallic' emperors, Postumus and Tetricus, who have left considerable traces in Britain, should have been included. The author has certainly succeeded in his expressed intention of conveying *multum in parvo*, and the book must already have been useful to thousands. It is not, unfortunately, always reliable.

Had the author lived, he would no doubt have corrected a large number of errors. Of the two inscribed milestones quoted on p. 63, the first has a complete line omitted, and in the other the word **NEP(OS)** is omitted and the stone is assigned to Nerva, though the name of Hadrian duly appears on it. In the caption to Pl. VI, Fig. 11, the name of the Centurion **M. FAVONIVS M. F. POL.** (sc. *Pollia tribu*) **FACILIS** is given as 'Marcus Favonius Marci filius: *Politus facilis*' (sic; my italics). On Pl. III, 6, 'the Wall west of Housesteads' has become 'West wall of Housesteads', which is at least misleading; and so, to the un-Latinized, is the statement that from *Agricola's* forts 'excursions were often made'. *Legati iuridici* (correctly explained on p. 97) are on p. 21 described as 'pleaders in the law courts'. *Praeses* is not well translated 'president' (p. 99), nor did Seviri Aug. constitute a whole social class

(ib.). P. 46 reads as though Bede (called St. Bede on p. 39) gave a modern archaeological description of Hadrian's Wall. By misprints, L. Septimius becomes 'Septimus' (p. 104), Manlius Valens, 'Martius' (p. 15), Artorius Iustus, 'Astorius' (p. 31), Pupienus 'Papienus' (p. 141). The explanation of the 'XP' monogram is given twice on p. 109. Finally it may be pointed out that had a copy of the book been sent to C.R. in 1945, attention could have been drawn to these errors in time to correct them before reprinting.

A. R. BURN.

University of Glasgow.

Elizabeth DAWES and Norman H. BAYNES: *Three Byzantine Saints*. Contemporary Biographies of St. Daniel the Styliste, St. Theodore of Sykeon, and St. John the Almsgiver. Pp. xiv + 275. Oxford: Blackwell, 1948. Cloth, 21s. net.

In this book we are given translations of contemporary lives of three Byzantine ascetic saints, Daniel the Styliste of the fifth, Theodore of Sykeon of the sixth, and John the Almsgiver, *'Ο Ελεημον'*, of the seventh century. Such lives are of abundant interest for the light they cast on Byzantine ideas and ways of life, light rarely to be found in the works of more important historians. Professor Baynes's able introduction sketches the view of Christianity shared by these writers and their readers; how the lives of these holy men seemed to them an incessant struggle against the hordes of demons with which the world was infested, a struggle rewarded with the power of working miracles. Nothing we read of the hermits of the Egyptian desert exceeds the austerity and the miracles of these three saints. Only in John the Almsgiver do we discern a human being. Theodore seems to have been the most ferocious of the three. He wore a terrible corset of iron as a penance, and the curious in such things may note with interest that in the monastery of Xenophontos on Mount Athos a similar machine is preserved. The wearers of these things were called *οιδεραύντες*.

Intended for popular reading these texts have a linguistic importance because in them the modern language then in process of formation makes its earliest appearances. The book gives no texts: space also forbids any discussion of this point, but I think the use of the modern form of *ἐκβάλλω*, *βγάζω*, 'I bring out', casts light on the odd phrase (see p. 189) *ἐκβαλὼν λιτήρ*. *Πλάσμα*, p. 150, is surely used in the common modern sense of a 'creature of God', a 'person'. The names of the authors give every assurance that these translations are in every way faithful to the texts, and Dr. Dawes's English always reads smoothly and pleasantly.

R. M. DAWKINS.

Exeter College, Oxford.

Eumusia. Festgabe für Ernst Howald. Pp. 207. Erlenbach, Zürich: Rentsch, 1947. Stiff paper.

In this volume members of the Faculty of Philosophy of Zürich pay tribute to their Rector on his

sixtieth birthday. The essays cover a wide range, from Hesiod to El Greco: five concern classical studies.

A. von Salis traces, shrewdly and interestingly, the pedigree of *Imagines Illustrium* from Varro's *Hebdomades*, through such unexpected sources as the picture of the seven sages in an Ostian house of the second century, to an illustrated Byzantine manuscript of the sixth century. Ernst Meyer discusses, with reference to the terms used (especially the connotation of *res publica*) the difference between the Greek and Roman political outlook. Fritz Wehrli adds some observations to the increasingly popular discussion of the ancient theory of historiography. Ernst Kirch collects examples of Hesiod's interest in explaining names by adding their literal meaning, in contrast to Homer. This special interest he attributes to the need for a Boeotian to explain words taken from an alien dialect, a need not felt by Homer, whose natural speech was the old Ionic dialect. Franz Stoeffl, in 'Leben und Dichtung im Sparta des siebenten Jahrhunderts', analyses Alcman's *Parthenaion* and suggests that the two divisions of the chorus represent conflicting ways of life, the free imaginative life of the old aristocracy and the iron discipline of the warrior state, trumpeted by Tyrtaeus and confirmed by the Messenian revolt—an interesting suggestion which perhaps is pressed too far.

Carlo ANTI: *Guida per il visitatore del Teatro Antico di Siracusa*. Pp. 117; 3 plates, 12 figs. Florence: Sansoni, 1948. Stiff paper, L. 200.

This guide-book is meant for visitors on the spot and should serve its purpose very well, but the illustrations are hardly adequate for it to be easy to follow in the study the evidence for each stage of development.

A point not always appreciated is that the classical semicircular auditorium was not cut till Timoleon rebuilt the theatre between 335 B.C. and 300, mainly in order to hold there the new democracy's popular assemblies.

For theatrical performances a stage was run in from the side on rollers and the machinery was such that this stage must have been at least two metres higher than the orchestra, so that it is clear that at this time, the time of the New Comedy, no need was felt for any communication between actors and chorus.

This theatre had been preceded by two, each of which had a trapezoidal auditorium cut in the rock. The second and larger was built after 475 B.C. The stage communicated with the orchestra by three steps. It was on this stage that the works of Epicharmus were shown and Aeschylus produced his *Women of Aetna*.

We should like to know Sig. Anti's authority for the name of its architect 'Damócopo'. After the fall of the democracy a permanent stage replaced Timoleon's movable structure. The whole auditorium was enlarged by Hieron II and a stage building added in stone, and the theatre suffered little change till in the first or second century of

our era a Roman stage, 7 metres deep, was added, and the orchestra was adapted for gladiatorial shows.

In the third century the whole theatre was rebuilt in the Roman taste, and its final stage in the fourth century saw the orchestra turned into a basin for *naumachiae*.

Life is given to the remains by a sketch of the life of the theatre, and of what is known, or guessed, of the works played in it and their authors, which follows the detailed description of the evidence for each period.

J. P. DROOP.

H. J. ROSE: *Aeneas Pontifex*. (Vergilian Essays, No. 2.) Pp. 28. London: Phoenix Press, 1948. Paper, 1s. 6d. net.

An essay by Professor Rose on Virgil (he must forgive my unrepentant spelling) or on Roman religion is always full of interest and suggestion; this pamphlet, which combines both topics, is no exception, but its main contention is not finally convincing. Crudely put the theme is this: Virgil was 'the poetical representative of Augustus' and supported his religious revivals and innovations. On the death of Lepidus in 12 B.C. Augustus assumed the office of Pontifex Maximus and his intention of doing so was probably known before Virgil's death in 19 B.C. Virgil's *Aeneas* represents Augustus; therefore he is pictured as a pontifex.

After an illuminating description of the character and duties of the pontifices Rose proceeds to his proofs. They are in effect three. (1) The pontifices were never the inventors of religious rites and traditions, but only repositories, who knew where to look for an answer to problems. Aeneas is never 'the giver of recondite sacral knowledge', but only the recipient; he learns from Helenus or the Sibyl or Anchises and is notoriously stupid at interpreting omens or oracles. This is at best a very negative similarity. (2) Aeneas is 'well enough versed in ritual to be correct in all he does relating to the gods', especially in the worship of Vesta and the Penates. This is not necessarily pontifical, but a salient part of his *pietas*; and his worship of the Penates is more often, as for instance on the many occasions when he rises early and *sopitos susciat ignis*, the fulfilment of the duties of the *paterfamilias*; we may remember that in the flight from Troy it was Anchises, not Aeneas, who carried the Penates, because he was then *paterfamilias* (*Aen.* ii. 717). Rose himself speaks of Aeneas (p. 26) as an expert in the ritual of his own household gods. (3) Aeneas' knowledge of the ritual of the dead is illustrated at some length, —but had the pontifices any special connexion with it?

One must take any contention of Rose's with respect, but it is hard to see that the interesting collection of facts here made proves more than that Virgil, like Augustus, had a deep interest in Roman ritual and custom, and therefore represented Aeneas as in every respect *pius* in his

religious duties. That he was meant to resemble a pontifex in particular is hardly demonstrated. But for all that this is a fascinating essay.

CYRIL BAILEY.

Studia varia Carolo Gulielmo Vollgraff a discipulis oblatæ. Pp. 194. Amsterdam: North-Holland Publishing Company, 1948. Cloth, fl. 12.

The long list of Professor Vollgraff's publications which is added to this volume is remarkably various and the variety is to some degree reflected in the twelve essays dedicated to him by his pupils. The longest essay is by A. Roes on the goat and the horse in the cult of hither Asia; she traces with a wealth of examples the association of these animals with sun symbols, starting with proto-Iranian pottery and ending with modern embroidery; the story touches Greece in geometric vase-painting and in some coins of the classical period. J. Gonda discusses Indian pessimism and stresses its fundamental difference from anything in Greek thought. E. J. Jonkers considers why the Greeks used 'Medes' rather than 'Persians' as the normal name for the Persians and quotes modern parallels for such inexact conservatism in nomenclature.

The Ionian migration is dated to the ninth century by J. H. Jongkees on the evidence of the archaeological finds; he distinguishes between insignificant Mycenaean settlements and the foundation of Greek towns along the coast of Asia Minor. (It would follow that the epic had a correspondingly longer period of growth on the mainland of Greece.) Various psychological phenomena in the poems of Homer are studied by C. C. van Essen, who starts from an analysis of Hector's speech in *Iliad* xxii. 96 f. The possibility of a relationship between Sophocles and Heraclitus is examined with full quotation of passages by J. C. Kamerbeek, who inclines finally with great caution to accept a parallelism between the two authors. Empedocles' theory of sight is interpreted by W. J. Verdenius, and C. J. de Vogel defends Robin's construction of Plato's theory of ideas in the period of the later dialogues. B. J. van Groningen seeks an explanation for the gnomic aorist; he provides a good formula when he says that the gnomic aorist 'reports a fact which is certain or is considered certain, an important and definitive fact, which decides once and for all present and future analogous cases'. H. G. Beyen has a very interesting discussion of the owner of the Villa Farnesina and suggests that it was built originally for Marcellus and Iulia in 25 B.C. and redecorated about 19 B.C. for Iulia and Agrippa.

Two essays are concerned with the classics today. A. W. de Groot pleads for the application of modern structural linguistics to the study of Latin grammar and H. W. F. Stellwag maintains that each generation studies the classics in its own way for its own purposes and that our organic bond with ancient Greece lies in the idea of Paideia.

T. B. L. WEBSTER.
University College, London.

Richard B. SHERLOCK: *The Syntax of the Nominal Forms of the Verb, exclusive of the Participle, in St. Hilary.* (Patristic Studies, Vol. LXXVI.) Pp. xix + 365. Washington: Catholic University of America Press, 1947. Paper.

THIS, says the preface, is the seventh dissertation in the *Patristic Studies* on the Latinity of St. Hilary. *Mulla* (says Hilary himself) *de numeri huius sanctificationis sunt cognita*. But there seems little more given to Hilary above others by this contribution, unless it be a greater number of misprints. True, one must admire the diligence and care expended on such a painstaking collecting of instances; but a boiling-down of Leumann-Hofmann or Kühner-Stegmann is no substitute for independent thought, and the attribution to Hilary (p. 303) of a use of the future infinitive active as a future infinitive passive is no kind of thought at all.

Even the decotion of the authorities is not always satisfactory. Leumann (p. 226) says the gerund is purely Latin, not being found in Oscan or Umbrian; Hofmann (p. 593) accepting Ribezzo's interpretation (*R.I.G.I.* x. 210) of *amvian(n)ud* would have gerund as well as gerundive to be common Italic. These irreconcilable views appear in our author thus (p. 1): 'with the exception of Oscan, the gerund is not found in other dialects and is considered as purely Latin'. Oil and water may not mix, but who likes may swallow both together.

I. M. CAMPBELL.

University of Glasgow.

Gilbert Charles PICARD: *Castellum Dimmidi.* (Gouvernement Général de l'Algérie, Direction des Antiquités, Missions Archéologiques.) Pp. 229; 19 plates, 16 figs., 2 plans. Paris: de Boccard, 1947. Paper.

CASTELLUM Dimmidi is a small Roman outpost at Messad on the south-eastern side of the Ouled-Nail Mountains. It was excavated in 1939 and 1941 by M. Picard and has yielded over forty inscriptions and other finds of the greatest interest. It is a fort of about half a hectare in extent, in which, despite variations owing to its position on a small irregular hill, the standard plan is recognizable, and it was occupied from A.D. 198 till 238. M. Picard has combined with his description of the fort a very instructive discussion of problems of the African limes zone, its settlement and its religious development. Dimmidi was one of a series of outposts maintained by Septimius Severus in accordance with his scheme of keeping watch along desert routes approaching areas of settlement, and the route here guarded also provided a short cut between Lambaesis and southern Mauretania, where trouble among the Mauri was endemic. It was abandoned when Gordian gave up the outpost system and retired upon a more closely defined frontier.

The garrison was at first a vexillation from the 3rd Legion, but latterly we find in addition a numerosus of Palmyrene cavalry. For them a special chapel was set aside in which rough frescoes

of their god Malagbel were found. Emperor worship was of course practised, but while the officers tended also to patronize Syrian cults, the troops, when not Syrians themselves, favoured deities with a more local flavour; and in this connexion we may note the curiously distorted shape of the principia, determined by a sacred well of some healing djinn, which must have existed on this hill before the arrival of the Roman army, and which it was deemed prudent not to destroy. Two other curiosities are a small hollow altar containing carefully preserved ashes, and an inscription mentioning the consecration of an *Ara Cerei* on 3 May. Picard identifies this with the archaic Latin cult of the Floralia, whose yearly festival ended on 3 May, and points out that Flora, Ceres, or Terra Mater, whatever she might be called, had as her consort Iuppiter Cerus.

There are photographs of some of the pots found, but it is to be hoped that a more detailed account of this well-dated group of pottery, with drawings, will in due course find its way into some appropriate publication.

The name of the station, Castellum Dimmidi, has happily been preserved on three inscriptions; it has also survived almost unchanged in the name of the neighbouring oasis of Demmad.

OLWEN BROGAN.

Cambridge.

B. BILIŃSKI: *De Apollodoreis in Pliniana Graeciae descriptione (N.H. iv. 1-32) obviis.* (Travaux de la Société des Sciences et Lettres de Wrocław, Série A, No. 7.) Pp. 134. Breslau: Lach, 1948. Paper.

It is here persuasively argued that a main authority of Pliny in his short description of Greece was the commentary of Apollodorus on the *Catalogue of Ships*; this was used indirectly, however, through somebody who had contaminated it with other Greek writings of a similar kind (hence some discrepancies, as when Pliny accepts a common placing of Nestor's Pylos against the right view of Apollodorus). The case is worked out with many topographical details and recent references, so that the discussion will be found of value not only for Pliny's sources and methods but also for the Homeric picture of Greece.

J. O. THOMSON.

University of Birmingham.

Bronisław BILIŃSKI: *Les voies du monde antique vers les terres slaves à la lumière des témoignages littéraires de l'antiquité.* Pp. 35. Breslau: Universitas, 1947. Paper.

THIS article (in Polish, with summary in French) is part of the introduction to a larger work: *Fontes ad Slavorum terras spectantes e veteribus scriptoribus Graecis et Latinis collecti.* Its argument is that ancient information about the lands north of the Euxine and of Dacia was collected along trade routes, and that these followed the rivers, Tyras, Hypanis, and Borysthenes, and especially the northern tributaries of the last-named, Zbrucz,

Seret, and Strypa. The traffic was not all in one direction; the 'Pomeranian' culture spread downstream from the Neuri and Venedi, who are regarded as pre-Slav. The use of the Dniester tributaries explains the belief that the Dniester itself rose in the Polesian swamps (Hdt. 4. 48), with consequent distortion of the topography.

After the fifth century, tribal movements obstructed trade and exploration, until the Mithraic Wars. Agricola's map extended Dacia to the Baltic, regarded as the northern Ocean. Pliny thought that the Neuri had been pushed west by the Venedi; and so forth.

Finally, Ptolemy makes use once more of routes along the Bug and the Vistula, with more confusion of streams, and consequently of topography.

JOHN L. MYRES.

Oxford.

Ashmolean Museum: Guide to the Greek, Roman, and Chinese Coins. Pp. 51; frontispiece, 9 plates. Oxford: printed for the Visitors of the Museum, 1948. Paper, 2s. 6d. net.

THE Oxford Coin Collection should, perhaps, be better known to scholars; and it is to be hoped that some well-deserved advertisement will be given by this Guide, attractively produced and illustrated, testimony in itself to the energy and enterprise of the Ashmolean numismatists. The Greek and Roman sections, primarily, will attract readers of this notice.

The Oxford Cabinet, in its inception due mainly to the amalgamation of various college collections in the Ashmolean Museum, has been fortunate in its more recent acquisitions, which form the bulk of the exhibition with which the Guide is concerned. Outstanding are the coins from the collections of two great scholars, Evans and Oman. Some Oman coins are shown on Plates VI and VII; as a whole they considerably strengthen the Greek section at Oxford, in no field more notably than in the splendid range of Hellenistic ruler-portraits. Plate V displays a selection of the Cretan coins which were one of Evans's great interests, possibly not familiar to all those who know his work on the Minoan civilization.

It is, however, in the Roman section that the Oxford Cabinet is best stocked; and the Roman part of the Guide provides especially fascinating reading, not only to numismatists but to all who are concerned with Roman history and who may not have realized the intimate historical evidence

continuously provided by the coins. Here again it was Evans who mainly enriched the Oxford Cabinet in recent years. Plate IV shows some of his Civil War and Carausius coins, but his interest did not stop there. His splendid series of the Constantinian and later periods is also to be found in the Museum, though not in the Guide. He was, moreover, at the end of his life, reaching out into the sub-Roman period in which the persistence of at least the outward forms of 'Romanitas' is so striking—witness Plate VIII, illustrating the Anglo-Saxon gold coins of the unique Crondall hoard, which was so suitably acquired by the Museum 'as a visible memorial to Sir Arthur Evans'.

Two criticisms: the plates of the classical section, indicated as scale +, are in fact slightly reduced; and 'Seleucus II' is evidently a mistake for 'Seleucus III' on Plate VII. This does not really lessen the value of this attractive booklet, for which one wishes a wide circulation.

G. K. JENKINS.

British Museum.

J. D. BEAZLEY: *Some Attic Vases in the Cyprus Museum.* Pp. 51; 8 plates. London: Oxford University Press, 1948. Paper, 7s. 6d. net.

IN this British Academy lecture Professor Beazley publishes a number of vases in the Cyprus Museum, some for the first time. We may note the following points: additions to the œuvre of the Tleson painter and Eretria painter, classified list of courting scenes (man and boy), discussion of certain groups from Gigantomachies, of warriors tiptoeing with himation held in front of the face (Soph. *Aj.* 245 is tentatively compared), of warriors picking up spear and shield, of covered cups, and of jumpers taking off for a standing jump (the vase in Cyprus shows Eros in this position). Students of the Greek drama will be interested in the bearded figure in a short garment dancing on a lekythos by the Bowdoin Painter (480/460 B.C.). Professor Beazley interprets him as Dionysus and suggests that his attitude is one of the schemata of the *okurus*; he compares for the attitude a satyr on a cup by Makron (Munich 2567) and for the garment a satyr on a lost cup by Apollodorus (Hartwig 637); these two satyrs are the earliest wearing the costume (drawers) of the satyr play (both perhaps about 490 B.C.).

T. B. L. WEBSTER.

University College, London.

SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS

CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

XLIV. 2: APRIL 1949

J. A. O. Larsen, *Consilium in Livy xlvi. 18. 6-7 and the Macedonian Synedria*: maintains, against Feyel in *B.C.H.* lxx (1946), the traditional view that in 167 B.C. Macedonia had no central government but was divided into four *merides*, each with a representative government. A. C. Andrews, *Celery and Parsley as Foods in the Greco-Roman Period*: *απίου* and *σέλινου* are both celery, not parsley (*περποδέλνου*), which was not common in the wild state. M. P. Cunningham, *The Novelty of the Heroides*: the Heroides are lyric-dramatic monologues written for the stage, where they were performed with music and dancing; it is to this that Ovid himself refers in *A.A.* 3. 346 *ignotum hoc alitis ille novavit opus*. B. B. Boyer, *The Histories of Tacitus*: review of Giarratano's edition (Rome, 1939). P. W. Harsh, *Plato Symp. 194 b and a Raised Position in the Theater*: the reference must be to the Theatre of Dionysos, not to the *proaon* in the Odeum, but there is no evidence here for a raised stage as the normal position of actors. T. G. Rosenmeyer, *The Numbers in Plato's Critias*: replies to R. S. Brumbaugh in *C.P.* xlvi. 40, rejecting his assumptions that Atlantis was a state of confusion and that the *Critias* is a serious philosophical work, and criticizing the details of his argument.

XLIV. 3: JULY 1949

R. T. Bruère, *The Latin and English Versions of Thomas May's Supplementum Lucani*: the Latin version is the later and is not merely a translation of the English but a revision in which inconsistencies are removed and the poem is made more compact and the tone more republican and anti-Caesarian. J. A. O. Larsen, *The Origin and Significance of the Counting of Votes*: counting was unknown in Homeric times and voting by acclamation continued at Sparta; at Athens, and probably elsewhere, counting had been introduced by the seventh century, perhaps first in elections and judicial decisions and later in popular assemblies. Discusses voting procedures at Athens and Rome and the democratic and oligarchical tendencies which they respectively fostered. A. C. Andrews, *The Carrot as a Food in the Classical Era*: a full account of ancient varieties and their names. R. S. Brumbaugh on *Plato Rep.* 587 d: the list of types is constructed on the same principles as that in *Phaedrus* 248: the 'intermediates', which with those mentioned make up nine, cover the various types suggested by the earlier part of the dialogue. L. Pearson, *Callisthenes and the Zenon Papyri*: in Zenon Pap. II, No. 6 proposes *οὐναγώη τῶν προ[αὐτῶν]* for *προ[ενύν]ων* of the edd. and takes the reference to be to a rhetorical work of Call., not a documentary one. J. H. Oliver, *On Two Athenian Archons*: on the identification of the archons Aristaeus and Arabianus.

DIONISO

XII (N.S.), 1: JANUARY 1949

E. Fraenkel, *Alcuni problemi nell' "Agamennone" di Eschilo*: *χορεύομαι* (31) does not imply that the Watchman dances on the stage; *ἐν' ὄμμάτων* (1428) refers to a bloodshot appearance of the eyes, not to a blood-stain on the face; the deliberation of the Chorus (1346 ff.) is ended, not by an attempt to enter the palace, but by the appearance of Clytaemestra; in spite of their mention of swords (1651) it cannot be supposed that the Chorus were armed throughout the play. The episode of the eagles and the hare symbolizes but does not logically involve the guilt of Agamemnon; his dilemma (206 ff.) is a choice between two sins; notwithstanding modern interpretations of his character, he is presented by Aeschylus as a truly heroic and tragic figure. C. Kerényi, *Uomo e maschera*: an examination of the primitive use and meaning of masks especially in mysteries, Dionysiac cults, and initiation ceremonies; among the functions of the mask is to effect a mystic union of its wearer with the figure it represents. O. Tiby, *Note musicologiche al "Timeo" di Platone*: in 35 a-36 b the proportions used in the creation of the world-soul are those between the intervals of the Dorian mode; they reoccur in the distribution of the planetary orbits in 36 d. In 67 b-e, while the properties of sound are rightly distinguished, there is confusion between the cause of sound and the manner of its transmission. 80 a-b gives an incorrect account of musical concord. These passages contain the fundamental part of Pythagorean musical theory. F. Martinazzoli, *Alcesti e Socrate*: treats the similarity in the preparations for death of Alcestis (*Eur. Alc.* 158 ff.) and Socrates (*Plat. Phaedo* 115 a) with reference to the spiritual and intellectual affinities between Euripides and Socrates. L. M. Positano, *Sopra alcuni versi dei "Persiani" di Eschilo*: in 135 the correction *ἀρπονεθεῖς* has no support in the scholia, while in 541 *ἄκρογοος* may well be an ancient, not a Byzantine, reading. In 631-2 emendation is unnecessary; the genitive required by *τέρπας* can be understood from *κακῶν*, while that for *πήλεον* can be supplied from the context (following Triclinius) *οὗ νῦν ἡμεῖς ποιοῦμεν, ηγουν τῶν θυσιῶν*. In 829 *κεχρημένων* is a worthless Byzantine conjecture. In 863 read *ἡμᾶς εὖ πράσσοντας δηγον οἰκους*.

EOS

XLII (1947): Fasc. I

Dedicated to Thaddaeus Sinko, for his seventieth birthday. C. F. Kumaniecki, *De Horatii carmine ad Plancum (carm. i. 7)*: discusses composition—imitated from Alexandrian epyllion; person—L. Munatius Plancus, not his son; application of myth—Plancus, like Teucer, was accused of betraying his brother, proscribed in 43; date—between 40 and 35, when Plancus was in the Greek

islands; and character—praise of Tibur, simplicity (luxury, is Horace's genuine feeling, but is also in the tradition of Greek lyric. L. Strzelecki, *Meletematon Tragicorum Specimen*: (1) Naevius, *Lyc.* frg. iii (= 19 Ribbeck) should be written *Libero secundo | queaque incedunt, omnis arvas || opterunt* (trochaic octonarii); *Libero secundo* = faveante Baccho; (2) Ennius, *Melan.* frg. iii (= 249 f.) is a complete verse, iambic dim.

acatalectic followed by a colon Reizianum, *re-*
gnunque nostrum ut sospitent || superstinentque; (3) Enn. *Teleph.* frg. iii (= 285) should be *cedo cave! | o quam vestitu's, squalida saeptus stola!* spoken by Clytaemestra; and frg. i follows in the reply of Telephus; (4) Pacuvius, *Chrys.* frg. vi (= 86 ff.) and vii (= 93)—frg. vii, omitting *terra* as spurious, should follow v. 86, completing the line: *terram: mater est ea, parv' corp'as, animam aether adiugat*; v. 88, which Ribbeck puts in frg. vi, should (as Scaliger thought) follow frg. xii, v. 99; frgg. v, vi, and vii are rightly assigned by Ribbeck to *Chrysippus*, not *Chryse*; (5) Pacuv. *Ilion.* frg. iv (= 197 ff.)—198 prefer version of schol. on Hor. *Sat.* ii. 3. 60, *exsurge et sepeli me*, to Cicero's, which was probably from memory; 200 read *semissariis* (*hap. leg. in Digest.* xxx. i. 116, § 1) for unintelligible *semiassi reis*; whole is mixture of iambic and trochaic lines, and trochaic septenarii doubtless predominated in the scene, as they do in Plautus, where this mixture is frequent—hence Cicero called them *septenarii*; (6) Pacuv. *Med.* frg. xviii (= 237)—simply invert order of last two words, giving cretic dim. followed by trochaic dim. cat., a combination used by tragedians as well as Plautus. G. Kowalski, *de Phrynes pectore nudato*: attacks P.-W. s.v. 'Phryne' (A. Rabitschek) for blindly following Athenaeus and misunderstanding the character of Greek *meretrices*, who were almost respectable; the other version, first in Quint. *inst. or.* ii. 15. 9, but also in Anonymus *Rh. Gr.* vii. 335. 3-8 Walz, that Phryne bared her own breast in an appeal for pity, is older and more probable, but both are inventions. G. Manteuffel, *In Citharistae fabulam Menandream observationes*: suggests readings: 41 πορνοβούκον] θελητόρα; 47 ἡ περιφολάς (cf. frg. 894 K.); 52 ἐπέντη. ἵω[μεν] τὴν τραχιστην̄ ἐκποδὸν; 57 ἐπειν̄ for ἐπειν̄; 61 οὐδὲ [θύκτησε] τῇ φυγῇ κατὰ τοῦτο γε; conjectural restoration of 69-101. v. Steffen, *de tragediae Graecae forma primigena*: earliest writers use not *τραγῳδία* but *τραγικός* with some noun (Solon in elegiacs must have said *τραγικὸν δρᾶμα*); the *τράγοι* who sang dithyrambic songs to Dionysus before Arion's time were not satyrs but shepherds, who wore goat-skins (cf. Eur. *Cycl.* 80, Theocr. vii. 15); for their association with Dionysus cf. Soph. *Ichneutae*, 217 ff., especially 222, where he reads καίπολων ὅχλοι. Marian Plezia, *Quaestionum Isagogicarum specimen tria*: (1) Chrysippeum: title of Chrysippus' work in Diog. Laert. vii. 189 ff. = S.V.F. ii, p. 7. 15, should read περὶ συλλογισμῶν εἰσαγωγῆς (not -ῶν) πρὸς Ζήνωνα ἄ; probably the same book as his πρώτη περὶ συλλογισμῶν εἰσαγωγῆς (fragment in Sext. Emp. *adv. math.* viii. 223 ff. = S.V.F. ii. 80 f.); (2) Apollodorum: fragments of Apollodorus Seleucensis probably all come from

one work, *eis τὰ δόγματα εἰσαγωγῆς*, in three books, *Φωνική* and *'Ηθική* preceded by a book on dialectic; (3) Clitomacheum: book of Clitomachus quoted by Cic. *Lucullus*, 32. 102-4, perhaps called *εἰσαγωγῆς ἦρης Ἀκαδημαϊκῆς φιλοσοφίας πρὸς Λουκίδιον*, was a summary of his περὶ ἑτοχῆς (δε sustinendis assensionibus libri IV), quoted by Cic. *Luc.* 31. 98, probably sent to Lucilius to provide arguments against Stoic attacks. B. Biliński, *de Lucano Troiae peregrina*: Lucan in ix. 950-79 used a recent geographical guide-book to Troy, based on Demetrius of Scepsis, Polemo (*περιήργησις Ιδίου*), and Hegesianax, as well as Curtius Rufus, *Historia Alexandri Magni*, and Pseudo-Callisthenes on Alexander; and he may have visited the site. G. Kowalski, *de commentarii in Hermogenis Status et tribus interpretibus confecti* (*Rh. Gr.* iv. Wals) *recensio in codice Par. Gr. 2932 (Py) obvia*: continued from *Eos* xli (1940-6), fasc. i. 1. 46-80. R. Guiland, *Le droit divin à Byzance*: shows, with many detailed examples, how the theory of the divine right of kings, pushed to extremes under the Byzantine Empire, squared with frequent rebellions, ready abdications, and easy transfers of allegiance, and fostered astrology and necromancy. F. Sokolowski, *Caractère du culte des monarques hellénistiques*: a Greek conception, not of oriental origin; king was seen as an instrument or new manifestation of the city's patron - goddess. G. Lanowski, *La passion de Daphnis*: examines Theocr. Id. i. 64-145: the affliction of Daphnis was physical: impotence, hence his references to Anchises and Adonis; and his third visitor, Priapus, hits the truth, as the third usually does in folk-tales. Ludowica Rychlewska, *In Anonymum Hermogenis Statuum interpretem* (*Rh. Gr.* vii. 397-442 W.) cum *Nilo* (*Par. Gr. Suppl.* 670; fol. 36 v-65r) *collatum observationes criticae*: continued from *Eos*, xli (1940-6), fasc. i. 1. 173-82.

XLII. 1947: ZESZYT 2

In Polish. S. Srebny, *Tadeusz Zieliński* (with photograph). W. Strzelecki, *Gustaw Przychocki* ur. 14. ii. 1884 um. 4. ii. 1947. J. Krokowski, *Mieczysław St. Popławski* ur. 1884 um. 1946. W. Steffen, *Franciszek Dubas*. W. Klinger, *Pierwiatek autobiograficzny w Sofoklesowym Edypie w Kolonie*. W. Steffen, *Dramaty satyrowe Aischylosa*. J. Czerniatowicz, *Neoplutoponeros w komediach attyckich*. B. Biliński, *Najstarsze świadectwa starożytne o Wiśle*.

ERANOS

XLVII (1949): fasc. 1-2

D. Tabachovitz, *Interdum magnus dormitat Homerus*: maintains that the illogical excess of negatives in Od. 3. 27 is a slip, and compares Soph. *Ant.* 4, Thuc. 7. 75. 4 (οὐδὲ ἀλγεῖς ἐπιθεασμῶν), Hyperid. *Epitaph.* 20. G. Rudberg, *Diogenes the Cynic and Marcus Aurelius*: thinks that M. Aur. xi. 6. 4 indicates a belief that Diogenes was inspired by or adapted Old Comedy as well as tragedy. G. Björck, *'I don't know what to do' in Greek*: gives many instances of the idiom οὐκ ξέω

ree books, dialectic; quoted by *etoyayy*, was a *dis assen-* c. 31, 98, arguments *Lucano* and a recent *Deme-* *lou*, and *Historia* scenes on the site. *is Status* *wals* *viva*: con- R. Guillet with many the divine under the ancient rebels of Romancy. *marques* of oriental or new goddess. examines Daphnisences to Varro, Pria- does in *onymum* *vii*. 397-*ols.* 36 *v-* ed from

τι πονέν, none certainly earlier than N.T. and Josephus. T. Wikström writes at length on the syntax of Vettius Valens and discusses the reading and meaning of several passages. E. Fraenkel, *Gellianum*: remarks that doubt whether Gellius read *tis* in *Pseudolus* 6 can be removed by recognizing an interpolation in his text (xx. 6. 9): he calls attention to another interpolation at xix. 8. 3 (*ille . . . est*). J. Svennung, *Zum Gebrauch der lateinischen Zahlwörter, besonders in Verbindung mit pondo*: I. When numbers are named or when one counts it is usual in Greek and Latin to employ the neuter, but the masculine also occurs in Latin. II. With *ponto*, the accusative is used, explicable by the series *libram pondo as valebat* (Varro), *asses libras pondo erant* (Varro), *paterae libras pondo* (Livy), *paterae quatuor pondo* (Livy). When *libras* is omitted, it is unusual to put the numeral in the feminine, usual to employ the neuter, whether of the cardinal (e.g. *triginta unum, ducenta*) or the distributive (e.g. *bina, quingena*). Both Cicero and Livy sometimes make a plural, e.g. *centum pondo*, the subject of a singular verb. III. To the middle of the 1st century A.D. *pondo* without *libras* is usual for larger numbers, but *libras* is later used more widely. Late Latin confuses *ponto* and *pondus* (e.g. *pondus xv* and *pondera xl*); *ponderis* for *ponto* is as early as *Bell. Afr.* 97. 3. The first passage in which *ponto* is clearly used as an indeclinable noun is Celsus 5. 18. 2 (*habet singulorum pondo*). H. Hagendahl, *Innehåller Caesar texten i De Bello Gallico främmande inslag?*: convincingly exposes the arbitrary methods of Meusel, Klots, and Jachmann in claiming interpolation in *de B.G.*, and supports Barwick's view that the books were separately published and contain a few additions made by Caesar himself to his own copy in the light of his later knowledge. E. L. B. Meurig Davies, *Ammianae*. D. Norberg, *Quelques proverbes latins versifiés*: publishes a few medieval lines from a Madrid MS. J. T. Kakridis, *Grekiska i Tunis*: prints a corrected version of a modern Greek document published in *Apophoreta Goto-burgensia* (1936), p. 1.

PHILOLOGUS

97: Heft 3

W. Schmid relates the picture of Socrates in Ar. *Nub.* to other evidence, showing that Aristophanes had a 'surprisingly good eye' not only for personal mannerisms but also for certain nuances of Socratic thought and methods at the stage of development these may have reached in the late 420s. Contains some observations on Pl. *Apol.* P. Thielscher reconstructs an elaborate relative chronology of the surviving Aristotelian writings on the basis of the internal cross-references: his results (too complex for summary here) appear diagrammatically at the end. A. Rehm handles the letter of Ptolemy VIII Euergetes II to his troops in Cyprus (cf. 5th Congrès Int. de Papyrol., Oxford, 1937, pp. 291 ff.). Notably in l. 27 R. removes *νιόν* and reads *παρά νάραν ρόν βίον*. W. H. Friedrich interprets Ann. frgg. 6, 7, 9 (V.) in the light of Lucretian and other reminiscences, leading to fine-spun recon-

struction of the Homer appearance. He relates fr. 35 to Ov. *Met.* xi. 674 ff. In fr. 521 he examines the protean character of *Discordia-Allecto* and argues for the reading 'palude'. He connects frgg. 472 and 519 with Lucr. iii. 642 ff. and other accounts of scythe-cars at battle of Magnesia, noting possible echoes in Virg. *Aen.* x. R. Merkelsbach resuscitates and amplifies arguments for an Aeneas-lay embedded in *Iliad* xx. (156-289). W. Schubart has notes (and some suggested restorations) on Sappho frgg. 2, 5-6, 25, 27^a, 31, 96, Alcaeus frgg. 27, 35, 49, 70, 73, 77, and Melinno (refs. to E. Diehl, *ALG*, 1936).

97: Heft 4

F. Scheidweiler has some suggestions of detail on Eur. *Alexandros*, mainly following Snell's treatment (*Hermes*, Einzelschrift 5, 1937). B. Snell has a warning concerning Lesserre's supplements of B.Mus. Pap. 1184 (*Mus. Hebr.* v (1948), pp. 6 ff.). H. Dahlmann examines Varro's etymology of the word *vates*, fixes its original meaning as 'prophet' in Ennius and early literature, and traces its emergence as a synonym for *poeta* in Augustan poets. Ends with a note on Virgil and Arcadia prompted by Snell's essay (*Entdeckung des Geistes*, pp. 268 ff.). In a separate essay he identifies Varro's 'De sua vita' with his work 'ad Libonem' on the strength of Macrob. iii. 18, 13 and gives some prosopographic notes on L. Scribonius Libo. H. Fränkel replies briefly to a point in W. H. Friedrich's treatment of Ennius' *Discordia* (Heft 3, pp. 291-3). Ernst Meyer communicates a summary of the result for Near-Eastern chronology of the Madi-palace archives and of the Chorsabad Assyrian King List (from preliminary publication of A. Poebel). He outlines briefly some effects of the 1st Babylonian dynasty date 1830-1531 on Hittite, Chaldaean, and Egyptian chronology. H. Diller compares the use of *προθέλυμνος* in Il. x. 15 and other authors (in the sense of *πρόροπτος*) with other instances (in sense of *συνέχης*) and gives an explanation. He has also, separately, some notes and emendations of Sextus Placitus, *Liber Medicinae ex Animalibus*. A. Rehm confirms his reading of l. 27 of the inscription he handled earlier (Heft 3, pp. 267 ff.) from a new squeeze of the stone and amends his restoration of l. 20. H. U. Instinsky examines the wording of C.I.L. vi. 944 (Titus-inscription) and shows that it refers only to the events of the Jewish war of A.D. 66 and after, and thus is accurate. G. Klaffenbach treats I.G. xii. 5. 593 (*lex Cea de funeribus*), S.I.G.³ 653^A (Ptoion), and Roussel's inscription from Laodicea, published in *Syria*, xxiii (1942-3), pp. 21 ff. W. Schmid offers emendations of Lucr. vi. 1276 f. (*pro re<curatum>* in 1281), Cic. *Rep.* i. 43 (*nutu ac <com>modo*), and argues for *broma* in Mart. iii. 50. 7.

We understand that financial conditions preclude any further issues of *Philologus*, and it seems that Volume 98, planned to commemorate Wilamowitz's 100th birthday, will not now appear. We extend our sympathy to the editors of *Philologus*, and hope to welcome it again when conditions are once more favourable.

REVUE DE PHILOLOGIE

LXXV. 1: (1949)

N. M. Condoléon, *Inscriptions de Chios*: (1) fragment of a chronicle on the arrival of the local hero Oenopion, showing several variations of the legends known from Ion and connexions with Thessalian mythology; (2) long decree, almost intact, honouring judges from Andros and Naxos; (3) agonistic inscription; (4) elegiac epitaph; (5) he proposes to restore ἔχοι (= ἀχοι) in a 5th-century inscr. published by Εὐάγγεληδίς. L. Alfonsi, *Ps. Esiodo in Properzio*: on the relation between Prop. ii. 3. 51-4 and the Hesiodic fragment published from a Florence papyrus by Vitelli in *St. It. Fil. Class.* 1935. R. Schilling, *Le temple de Vénus Capitoline et la tradition poméiale*: the Capitoline was, as all ancient evidence agrees, within the Servian *pomoerium*, and so the first violation of the rule barring foreign deities from the *pomoerium* was the admission of Venus Erycina there in 215 B.C., not the admission of the Magna Mater to the Palatine in 211: but in spite of her title Venus Erycina was felt to be a Roman deity: in her foreign capacity she had a temple of 18 B.C. outside the *pomoerium*. P. Fournier, *Notulae Plinianae*: (1) inconsistencies in P.'s account of the peach are due to confusion between *persica*, the peach, and *perseia*; (2) xvi. 115 and xiii. 130 defends *Venesi* as a latinization of *Bene-Zid*; (3) in xvii. 52 *cytisus* is a shrub lucerne (*Medicago arborea* L.), as in Virgil: in xvii. 186 and 204 it is the poisonous *Cytisus laburnum* L.; (4) in xvii. 75 *calabrix* is to be identified with the whitethorn *Crataegus oxyacantha*. L. J. Tondriaud, *Alexandre le Grand assimilé à différentes divinités*: a list with references to literature and art. A. La Penna, *Une interpolation dans l'Αονίς 'Ηρακλῆς*: rejects 437-42 as repetition from 374-9.

RIVISTA DI FILOLOGIA CLASSICA

XXVII. (N.S.), 1-2: 1949

L. Ferrero, *Attualità e tradizione nella Praefatio liviana*: discusses at length the value of Livy's preface as a 'programme' for his history, and finds that it is more conventional than the development of his history justifies. I. Lana, *Dell' epoca in cui visse Quinto Curtio Rufo*: argues that Curtius' work is to be dated to the first years of the reign of Claudius, and that the author is to be identified with the rhetor Q. Curtius Rufus mentioned by Suetonius. M. A. Levi, *Il prologo della Pharsalia*: defends the authenticity of *Phars.* i. 1-7 against L. Herrmann and others. E. Manni, *L'Egitto tolemaico nei suoi rapporti politici con Roma*: I. *L'Amicitia*: discusses the history of Rome's relations with Egypt from 273 to the death of Ptolemy Epiphanes, which marked a turning-point in those relations. G. Nenci, *La filobarbarie di Ecateo nel giudizio di Eracito*: discusses two fragments of Heraclitus (40 and 107 Diels) as evidence for Heraclitus' views about Hecataeus and for the meaning of βάρβαρος in Heraclitus. M. Guarducci, *Un fortunato epigramma sepolcrale*: discusses the distich οὐ ρόθαεν ἀλγενόν κτλ., of which eight versions are so far known from Asia Minor and the islands, and concludes that Γερέδαος Μαρτάρχης, to whom it is ascribed in one of its versions, was a Cypriote and probably of the Cinyrad family. L. Alfonsi, *Maeccenas i. 37-8*: discusses an emendation (*marmora Mimmeri*) communicated to him by Ernst Bickel, and concludes in its favour. G. Bolognesi, *Gr. στέφος—ricerca etimologica*: concludes that στέφος should be added to the increasing list of isoglosses which connect Greek with Armenian.

BOOKS RECEIVED

Excerpts or extracts from periodicals and collections are not included unless they are also published separately.

American Academy in Rome. Memoirs: Volume XIX. Pp. 145; 11 plates. New Haven: Yale University Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1949. Cloth, 16s. net.

Argenti (P. P.) and Rose (H. J.) The Folk-Lore of Chios. 2 vols. Pp. xiv+1199. Cambridge: University Press, 1949. Cloth, £7. 7s. net.

Bannet (L.) The Arrows of the Sun. [A novel.] Pp. 266. London: Cresset Press, 1949. Cloth, 10s. 6d. net.

Bengtson (H.) Einführung in die alte Geschichte. Pp. viii+185. Munich: Biederstein, 1949. Cloth, DM. 10.50.

Bouvet (A.) César: La Guerre d'Afrique. Texte établi et traduit. (Collection Budé.) Pp. li+129; maps. Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres', 1949. Paper.

Buschor (E.) Das hellenistische Bildnis. Pp. 71; 62 ill. on 16 plates. Munich: Biederstein, 1949. Cloth.

Castorina (E.) I 'Poetae Novelli'. Pp. xv+228. Florence: La Nuova Italia, 1949. Paper, L. 550.

Corinth. Results of Excavations conducted by the American School of Classical Studies at Athens.

Vol. XV, Part I: The Potters' Quarter. By A. N. Stillwell. Pp. xiii+137; plates. Princeton, N.J.: American School of Classical Studies at Athens, 1948. Cloth.

Danielsson (B.) Studies on the Accentuation of Polysyllabic Latin, Greek, and Romance Loan-Words in English, with special reference to those ending in -able, -ate, -ator, -ible, -ic, -ical and -ize. (Stockholm Studies in English, III.) Pp. xvi+644. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell (Oxford: Blackwell), 1948. Paper, kr. 20 (30s. net).

Des Places (E.) Pindare et Platon. Pp. 195. Paris: Beauchesne, 1949. Paper.

DeWitt (N. W. and N. J.) Demosthenes. Vol. VII: Funeral Speech, Erotic Essay, Exordia, Letters. With an English translation. (Loeb Classical Library.) Pp. xi+388. London: Heinemann, 1949. Cloth, 15s. net.

Ernout (A.) Pline l'Ancien: Histoire Naturelle, livre xii. Texte établi, traduit et commenté. Pp. 112. Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres', 1949. Paper.

Evans (E.) Tertullian's Treatise against Præreas. The text edited with a translation, introduction,

- and commentary. Pp. viii+342. London: S.P.C.K., 1948. Cloth, 21s. net.
- Excavations at Dura-Europos*. Final Report IV. Part IV, Fasc. 1: The Bronze Objects. By T. G. Frisch and N. P. Toll. Pp. viii+69; 17 plates. Part IV, Fasc. 2: The Greek and Roman Pottery. By D. H. Cox. Pp. 26; 5 plates. Part VI: The Coins. By A. R. Bellinger. Pp. ix+214; 42 plates, map. New Haven: Yale University Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1949. Paper, 11s. 6d., 5s. 6d., 27s. 6d. net.
- Field* (G. C.) The Philosophy of Plato. (Home University Library.) Pp. 219. London: Oxford University Press, 1949. Cloth, 5s. net.
- Frisch* (H.) Might and Right in Antiquity. Translated by C. C. Martindale. I: From Homer to the Persian Wars. (Humanitas, II.) Pp. 276. Copenhagen: Gyldendal, 1949. Paper, kr. 30.
- Fuchs* (H.) Tacitus: Annales. Vol. I (i-vi): pp. 258. Vol. II (xi-xvi): pp. 256. (Editiones Helveticae, Series Latina, 4.) Frauenfeld: Huber, 1949. Cloth and boards, 5, 6 Sw. fr.
- Gould* (H. E.) and *Whiteley* (J. L.) Vergil: Aeneid III. (Modern School Classics.) Pp. xxv+156; 16 ill., map. London: Macmillan, 1949. Cloth, 3s.
- Harsh* (P. W.) Iambic Words and Regard for Accent in Plautus. (Stanford University Publications, Language and Literature, Vol. VIII, No. 2.) Pp. 149. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1949. Paper, \$2.50.
- Hohl* (E.) Maximini Duo Iuli Capitolini. Aus dem Corpus der sog. Historia Augusta herausgegeben und erläutert. (Kleine Texte, 172.) Pp. 40. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1949. Paper, RM. 3.50.
- Hubbell* (H. M.) Cicero: De Inventione, De Optimo Genere Oratorum, Topica. With an English translation. (Loeb Classical Library.) Pp. xviii+466. London: Heinemann, 1949. Cloth, 15s. net.
- Jacoby* (F.) Attis: The Local Chronicles of Ancient Athens. Pp. vii+431. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1949. Cloth, 35s. net.
- Kakridis* (J. T.) Homeric Researches. (Skrifter utgivna av Kungl. Humanistiska Vetenskaps-samfundet i Lund, XLV.) Pp. viii+168. Lund: Gleerup, 1949. Paper, kr. 15.
- Knight* (W. F. J.) Vergil: Selections from the Eclogues, Georgics, and Aeneid. (The Roman World Series.) Pp. 112. London: Allen & Unwin, 1949. Cloth, 4s. 9d.
- Lucas* (D. W.) The Ion of Euripides translated into English Prose with Introduction and Notes. Pp. xix+71. London: Cohen & West. Cloth, 5s. net.
- Lucas* (D. W.) The Medea of Euripides translated into English Prose with Introduction and Notes. Pp. xix+58. London: Cohen & West. Cloth, 5s. net.
- Marouzeau* (J.) Quelques aspects de la formation du latin littéraire. (Collection Linguistique publiée par la Société de Linguistique de Paris, LIII.) Pp. 232. Paris: Klincksieck, 1949. Paper, 600 fr.
- Maurer* (J. A.) A Commentary on C. Suetonius Tranquilli Vita C. Caligulae Caesaris, Chapters 1-31. Pp. 108. Philadelphia: privately printed, 1949. Paper.
- Müller* (G.) Lexicon Athanasianum. Lieferungen 1-3 (a-iv). To be completed in 10 parts of about 160 pp. each. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1944, 1949, 1949. Paper, RM. 30 each part.
- Nuchelmans* (J. C. F.) Die Nomina des sophokleischen Wortschatzes. Vorarbeiten zu einer sprachgeschichtlichen und stilistischen Analyse. Pp. 128. Utrecht: Beyer, 1949. Paper.
- Organ* (T. W.) An Index to Aristotle. Pp. vi+181. Princeton: University Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1949. Cloth, 27s. 6d. net.
- Peremans* (W.) Prosopographische Opzoeken betreffende Ptolemaisch Egypte. (Mededelingen van de Kon. Vlaamsche Academie van België, X. 3.) Pp. 22. Brussels: R. Flemish Academy, 1949. Paper.
- Pfeiffer* (R.) Callimachus. Volumen I: Fragmenta. Pp. xiv+520. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1949. Cloth, 50s. net.
- Piwonka* (M. P.) Lucilius und Kallimachos. Zur Geschichte einer Gattung der hellenistisch-römischen Poesie. Pp. 411. Frankfurt: Klostermann, 1949. Paper, DM. 20.
- Powell* (J. E.) Herodotus translated into English. 2 vols. Pp. xxxii+773; maps. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1949. Cloth, 21s. net.
- Roberts* (C. H.) and *Capelle* (B.) An Early Eucho-logium. The Dér-Balizéh Papyrus enlarged and re-edited. Pp. 72; 6 plates. Louvain: Bureaux du Muséon (7, Mont St. Antoine), 1949. Paper.
- Ross* (W. D.) Aristotle's Prior and Posterior Analytics. A Revised Text with Introduction and Commentary. Pp. x+690. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 42s. net.
- Seltman* (C.) Masterpieces of Greek Coinage. Pp. 128; illus. London: Faber (Oxford: Bruno Cassirer), 1949. Cloth, 21s. net.
- Sjøestedt* (M. L.) Gods and Heroes of the Celts. Translated by Myles Dillon. Pp. xxi+104. London: Methuen, 1949. Cloth, 8s. 6d.
- Solmsen* (F.) Hesiod and Aeschylus. (Cornell Studies in Classical Philology, Vol. XXX.) Pp. viii+230. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1949. Cloth, 16s. net.
- Souïlhé* (J.) Épictète: Entretiens, livre II. Texte établi et traduit. (Collection Budé.) Pp. 120 (double). Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres', 1949. Paper.
- Strzelecki* (L.) Studia Prosodiaca et Metrica. (Polska Akademia Umiejętności, Rozprawy Wydziału Filologicznego, LXVIII. 3.) Pp. 40. Cracow: Polish Academy, 1949. Paper.
- Thomson* (H. J.) Prudentius. With an English translation. In two vols. Vol. I. (Loeb Classical Library.) Pp. xvii+401. London: Heinemann, 1949. Cloth, 15s. net.
- Usener* (H.) Götternamen. Dritte unveränderte Auflage mit Geleitworten von M. P. Nilsson und E. Norden. Pp. x+391. Frankfurt: Schulte-Bulmke, 1948. Paper.
- Van Lennep* (D. F. W.) Euripides: Selected Plays. With introduction, metrical synopsis, and commentary. I: The Alkestis. Pp. 156. Leiden: Brill, 1949. Cloth, 6.50 g.
- Walzer* (R.) Galen on Jews and Christians. Pp. 101. London: Oxford University Press, 1949. Cloth, 10s. 6d. net.

INDEX

I. GENERAL INDEX

- ad summam*, 91
 air-photographs of archaeological sites, 2
 Albenque's *Inventaire de l'Archéologie Gallo-Romaine du Département de l'Aveyron*, 37
 Alexander the Great, deification of, 124
 Allan (D. J.) Plato, *Republic* 368 a: 43; and on Joseph's *Knowledge and the Good in Plato's Republic*, 19
 Ammendola's *Eschilo: Le Coefore*, 71
Annuarie of the Faculty of Philosophy in the University of Skopje, 42
 Anti's *Guida per il visitatore del Teatro Antico di Siracusa*, 141
 Aristophanes' *Ολυμπίδης*, date of, 7
 Armstrong (A. MacC.) *Atlas the Malignant*, 50
 art of Greek Italy and Sicily, 114
 Ashmolean Museum: *Guide to the Greek, Roman, and Chinese Coins*, 144
 Ashmolean Museum's exhibition of air-photographs of archaeological sites, 2
Athenaeum summarized (XXVI i-iv), 75
 Athenian Empire, protection of citizens in, 9
 Atticus as poet, 90
 Austin's *Quintilian Institutionis Oratoriae Liber XII*, 108
 axe-contest in the *Odyssey*, 3
 Bailey (C.) on Rose's *Aeneas Pontifex*, 142
 Balsdon (J. P. V. D.) Long-term Commands at the end of the Republic, 14
 Barker's *The Politics of Aristotle*, 100; his *Traditions of Civility*, 136
 Beare (W.) The Date of the *Bellum Punicum*, 48; Naevius and the *Alimonium Remi et Romuli*, 49; on Keller's *Iste Deiktikon in the early Roman Dramatists*, 72
 Beazley (J. D.) *Theophrastus Char.* 21 6: 42; A Passage in Ion of Chios, 83
 Beazley's *Some Attic Vases in the Cyprus Museum*, 144
 Bell (H. I.) on Wegener's *Some Oxford Papyri—Plates and Paap's De Herodotii reliquiis in papyris et membranis Aegyptiis servatis*, 25
 Bell's *Egypt from Alexander the Great to the Arab Conquest*, 127
 Beuker's *Ciceron's Godsdienstigheid*, 34
 Biliński's *Les voies du monde antique vers les terres slaves à la lumière des témoignages littéraires de l'antiquité*, 143; his *De Apollodoreis in Pliniana Graeciae descriptione obvius*, 143
 Biscardi's *Manumissio per Mensam e Affrancazione Pretorie*, 74
 Bonner (S. F.) on Austin's *Quintilian Institutionis Oratoriae Liber XII*, 108
 BOOKS RECEIVED, 38, 78, 148
 Bos's *Plutarchus' Leven van Agesilaus*, 22
 Brégétu's *Le Roman de Sulpicia*, 104
 Brennan's *A Study of the Clausulae in the Sermons of St. Augustine*, 73
 Brogan (O.) on Albenque's *Inventaire de l'Archéologie Gallo-Romaine du Département de l'Aveyron*, 37; on Staehelin's *Die Schweiz in römischer Zeit* (third edition), 130; on Picard's *Castellum Dimidi*, 143
 Browning (R.) The Date of Petronius, 12; on Marmonière's *La Questione Petroniana*, 28; on Russo's *L. Annaci Seneca Divi Claudi Apocolocyntosis*, 109
 Burn (A. R.) A Metellus in Two Passages of Dio, 52; on *Kvntakau Σπουδαι* (E'-Z'), 72; *Mare pigrum et grave*, 94; on Winbolt's *Britain under the Romans*, 140
 Burn's *Pericles and Athens*, 119
 Butts's *The Glorification of Athens in Greek Drama*, 33
 Cahn's *Griechische Münzen archaischer Zeit*, 139
 calendar, Attic, 120
 Cambridge, Greek Play at, 42
 Campbell (A. Y.) *Aristophanes Thesm.* 855-7 and Euripides *Hel.* 1-3: 81
 Campbell (I. M.) on Sherlock's *The Syntax of the Nominal Forms of the Verb, exclusive of the Participle*, in St. Hilary, 143
 Cardona's *Polibio di Megalopoli: Storie*, 139
 Cary (M.) on van der Ploeg's *Theramenes en zijn Tijd*, 30; on Thomson's *History of Ancient Geography*, 111
 Cary's *Dionysius of Halicarnassus* (VI), 56
 Chadwick (H.) on Wolfson's *Philo*, 24
 Charlesworth (M. P.) on Delatte's *Les Traités de la Royauté d'Écphanté, Diotogène et Sthénidas*, 22
 Chrimse's *The Respublica Lacedæmoniorum ascribed to Xenophon*, 99
 Clarke (M. L.) on Tilley's *Vergil's Latium*, 26
 Classical Association, meeting of, 41
 Classical Philology summarized (XLIII 3), 37; (XLIII, 2, 4, XLIV 1), 75; (XLIV 2, 3), 145
 coins, Greek and Lydian, 85; Archaic Greek, 139; Ashmolean, 144
 Cook (R. M.) on Dunbabin's *The Western Greeks*, 113
 Cowell's *Ciceron and the Roman Republic*, 59
 Davison (J. A.) on Owen's *The Story of the Iliad as told in the Iliad*, 70
 Dawes and Baynes's *Three Byzantine Saints*, 141
 Dawkins (R. M.) on Hill's *A History of Cyprus* (II-III), 140; on Dawes and Baynes's *Three Byzantine Saints*, 141
 Delatte's *Les Traités de la Royauté d'Écphanté, Diotogène et Sthénidas*, 22
 Déonna's *La Vie privée des Délénis*, 116
 de Romilly's *Thucydide et l'imperialisme athénien*, 16
 de Saint-Denis's *Le vocabulaire des animaux marins en latin classique*, 29
 Diercks's *Tertullianus De Oratione*, 35
 Dilke (O. A. W.) The Metrical Treatment of Proper Names in Statius, 50
 Dioniso summarized (XI 2-4), 38; (XII 1), 145
 Droop (J. P.) on Anti's *Guida per il visitatore del Teatro Antico di Siracusa*, 141
 Duckett's *Anglo-Saxon Saints and Scholars*, 36
 Duff (P. W.) on Biscardi's *Manumissio per Mensam e Affrancazione Pretorie*, and on Levy's *Pauli Sententiae*, 74
 Duffin (P. B.) on Bos's *Plutarchus' Leven van Agesilaus*, 22
 Dunbabin (T. J.) on van Effenterre's *La Crète et le Monde grec de Platon à Polybe*, 63
 Dunbabin's *The Western Greeks*, 113
 Earp's *The Style of Aeschylus*, 95
 Eos summarized (XLII fasc. i), 145; (XLII zeszyst ii), 146
 Eranos summarized (XLVI iii-iv), 75; (XLVII i-ii), 146
 Eumusia: *Festgabe für Ernst Howald*, 141
 Evans (E.) on Diercks's *Tertullianus De Oratione*, 35
familia, 13
Festschrift für Edouard Tieche, 31
 Festugière's *Liberté et Civilisation chez les Grecs*, 34; his *Hippocrate, L'Ancienne Médecine*, 54; his *L'Hermitisme*, 138
 fish, Latin names of, 29

Flace
 Forst
 33;
 138
 Frase
 Freen
 sop
 fuller
 Geer's
 Gigan
 18
 Gnom
 Goggi
 refle
 Gomm
 l'im
 dide
 Chr
 crib
 bau
 Pol
 on
 Clas
 Gow (gravita
 Gre
 Con
 Grund
 (I-I
 Guthri
 Haarh
 Hamil
 Soc
 Hamm
 (IX)
 Handf
 obsi
 Harder
 tian
 Herter
 Spie
 Hill's A
 Hollada
 Hoonh
 Howale
 of, 1
 Hypno
 in sum
 ius an
 Jaeger
 Jenkins
 Greek
 Jones (and
 122;
 Jones (Jones
 L'An
 Joseph
 19
 Karo's
 Keller's
 tists,
 Ker (N
 Schol
 Kerényi
 Kidd (L
 Kilpatr
 Konvit
 presen
 Kumpak
 Délia
 Lamian
 Lane's

- Flacelière's *Plutarchus, Sur la Disparition des Oracles*, 34
 Forster (E. S.) on Lattimore's *The Odes of Pindar*, 33; on Murray's *Sophocles: Oedipus at Colonus*, 138; on Lucas's *Aphrodite*, 139
 Fraser (P.) *Zeus Seleukeios*, 92
 Freeman's *Companion to the Pre-Socratic Philosophers*, 53
 fuller's earths in Pliny, 51
 Geer's *Diodorus of Sicily* (IX), 72
 Gigon's *Sokrates, sein Bild in Dichtung und Geschichte*, 18
Gnomon, publication resumed, 42
 Goggin's *The Times of Saint Gregory of Nyssa as reflected in the Letters and the Contra Eunomium*, 73
 Gomme (A. W.) on de Romilly's *Thucydides et l'impérialisme athénien*, 16; on Grundy's *Thucydides and the History of his Age* (I-II), 62; on Chrmes's *The Respublika Lacedaemoniorum ascribed to Xenophon*, 99; on Pritchett and Neugebauer's *The Calendars of Athens*, 120; on *Essays in Political Theory presented to George H. Sabine*, 125; on Lord's *A History of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens*, 137
 Gow (A. F. S.) on Latte's *Theocriti Carmina*, 71
gravitas, 126
 Greenblade (S. L.) on Goggin's *The Times of Saint Gregory of Nyssa as reflected in the Letters and the Contra Eunomium*, 73
 Grundy's *Thucydides and the History of his Age* (I-II), 62
 Guthrie (W. K. C.) on Nilsson's *Greek Piety*, 133
 Haerhoff's *The Stranger at the Gate*, 126
 Hamilton (W.) on Freeman's *Companion to the Pre-Socratic Philosophers*, 53
 Hammond (N. G. L.) on Geer's *Diodorus of Sicily* (IX), 72
 Handford (S. A.) on van den Berg's *Anonymus de obsidione toleranda*, 36
 Harden's *Guide to the Ashmolean Museum's exhibition of air-photographs of archaeological sites*, 2
 Herter's *Vom Dionysischen Tanz zum komischen Spiel*, 70
 Hill's *A History of Cyprus* (II-III), 140
 Holladay (A. J.) on Burn's *Pericles and Athens*, 119
 Hoonhout's *Het Latijn van Thomas van Celano*, 35
 Howald (E.), volume in honour of sixtieth birthday of, 141
Hypon in legend of Philoctetes, 83
in summa, 91
ius anulorum, 12
 Jaeger's *Aristotle*, 21
 Jenkins (G. K.) on *Ashmolean Museum: Guide to the Greek, Roman, and Chinese Coins*, 144
 Jones (A. H. M.) on Thompson's *A History of Attila and the Huns*, 66; on Tarn's *Alexander the Great*, 122; on Lepper's *Trajan's Parthian War*, 128
 Jones (D. M.) *The Sleep of Philoctetes*, 83
 Jones (W. H. S.) on Festugière's *Hippocrate, L'Ancienne Médecine*, 54
 Joseph's *Knowledge and the Good in Plato's Republic*, 19
 Karo's *Greek Personality in Archaic Sculpture*, 131
 Keller's *Ista Desitikon in the Early Roman Dramatists*, 72
 Ker (N. R.) on Duckett's *Anglo-Saxon Saints and Scholars*, 36
 Kerényi's *Niobe*, 135
 Kidd (D. A.) Two Notes on Horace, 7
 Kilpatrick (G. D.) A Fragment of Musonius, 94
 Konvitz and Murphy's *Essays in Political Theory presented to George H. Sabine*, 125
 Kυρωταὶ Σηνούδαι (E'-Z'), 72
 Laidlaw (W. A.) on Déonna's *La Vie privée des Déliens*, 116
 Lamian War, aftermath of, 87
 Lane's *Greek Pottery*, 132
L'Antiquité Classique (XVII), 2
 Latte's *Theocriti Carmina*, 71
 Lattimore's *The Odes of Pindar*, 33
 Lawrence (A. W.) on Karo's *Greek Personality in Archaic Sculpture*, 131
 Lee (H. D. P.) on Barker's *The Politics of Aristotle*, 100
 Léonard's *Le Bonheur chez Aristote*, 102
 Lepper's *Trajan's Parthian War*, 128
 Lesky's *Thalatta: Der Weg der Griechen zum Meer*, 117
 Levy's *Pauli Sententiae*, 74
 Lockwood (J. F.) on Beuker's *Ciceron's Godsdienstigkeit*, 34; on Barker's *Traditions of Civility*, 136
 Loeb Classical Library: Dionysius of Halicarnassus (VI), 56; Diodorus Siculus (IX), 72
 long-term commands at the end of the Republic, 14
 Lord's *A History of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens*, 137
 Lucas (F. L.) on Thomson's *The Classical Background of English Literature*, 67
 Lucas's *Aphrodite*, 139
 Lucretius' alleged 'madness', 47
lupercus, etymology of, 135
lupus in fabula, 49
 Manson (T. W.) on Wikgren's *Hellenistic Greek Texts*, 34
manumissio, 74
 Marmorale's *La Questione Petroniana*, 28
 McDonald (A. H.) on Cary's *Dionysius of Halicarnassus* (VI), 56; on Poyer's *Selections from Cicero, De Republica*, 106
 Meiggs (R.) A Note on Athenian Imperialism, 9; on von Szádeczky-Kardoss's *Übersiedlung und Verpfanzung von Bevölkerungen in der Geschichte der Griechen*, 36
 mercenaries, used in Thessaly 321 b.c., 87
 Meurig Davies (E. L. B.) Two notes on Euripides, 49
 Milne (J. G.) *Herodotus* i 94: 85
 Morrison (J. S.) on Winnington-Ingram's *Euripides and Dionysos*, 96; on Webster's *Political Interpretations in Greek Literature*, 98
 Mozley (J. H.) on Hoonhout's *Het Latijn van Thomas van Celano*, 35
 Mure (G. R. G.) on Jaeger's *Aristotle*, 21
 Murray's *Sophocles: Oedipus at Colonus*, 138
 Musonius, fragment of, 94
 Myres (J. L.) 'Ἐκτις, ἔπος, ἔπομαι, ἔπιλευ', 46; on Snell's *Antike und Abendland*, 32; on Festugière's *Liberté et Civilisation chez les Grecs*, 34; on Biliński's *Les voies du monde antique vers les terres slaves à la lumière des témoignages littéraires de l'antiquité*, 143
 Naevius' *Bellum Punicum*, date of, 48
 Nilsson's *Die Religion in den griechischen Zauberpapyri*, 138
 obliquus, 8
Overseas Education (XIX 5), 1
 Owen's *The Story of the Iliad as told in the Iliad*, 70
 Oxford Classical Dictionary, 1
 Paap's *De Herodoti reliquiis in papyris et membranis Aegyptiis servatis*, 25
 Palestine, education in, 1
 papyri, 25, 138
 Paratore's *Apulei Metamorphoseon Libri IV-VI*, 61
 Pepe's *Tibullo Minore*, 104
 Pervigilium Veneris, date of, 139
 Philoctetes, sleep of, 83
 Philologus summarized (XCVII 1-2), 76, (XCVII 3-4), 147
 Picard's *Castellum Dimmidi*, 143
 Pickard-Cambridge (A. W.) on Herter's *Vom Dionysischen Tanz zum komischen Spiel*, 70
 Pieters's *Cratinus*, 55
 Platnauer (M.) Three Notes on *Aristophanes, Wasps*, 6; on Pieters's *Cratinus*, 55

- Pliny's description of fuller's earths, 51
ponitices, character and duties of, 142
 Poyer's *Selections from Cicero, De Republica*, 106
 Pritchett and Neugebauer's *The Calendars of Athens*, 120
proxenoi of Athens, 9
 Rattenbury (R. M.) on Taccone's *Sofocle: Filottete* and on Ammendola's *Eschilo: Le Coeure*, 71
rector, Cicero's conception of, 107
 Rees (D. A.) on Léonard's *Le Bonheur chez Aristote*, 102
Revue de Philologie summarized (LXXIV 2), 37.
(LXXV 1), 148
Rivista di Filologia Classica summarized (XXV, XXVI), 76. (XXVII 1-2), 148
 Robertson (D. S.) on Paratore's *Apulei Metamorphoseon Libri IV-VI*, 61
 Robertson (R. H. S.) The Fuller's Earths of the Elder Pliny, 51
 Rose (H. J.) on Flacelière's *Plutarque, Sur la Disparition des Oracles*, 34; on Kerényi's *Niobe*, 135; on Festugière's *L'Hermetisme*, 138; on Nilsson's *Die Religion in den griechischen Zauberpapyri*, 138
 Rose's *Aeneas Pontifex*, 142
 Russo's *L. Annaei Senecae Divi Claudi Apocolocyntosis*, 109
 Sabine (G. H.), essays presented to, 125
 Sandbach (F. H.) on Pepe's *Tibullo Mignore* and on Bréguet's *Le Roman de Sulpicia*, 104
saxum, used for 'bentonite', 52
 Scullard (H. H.) on Wilkin's *Eternal Lawyer*, 58; on Cowell's *Cicero and the Roman Republic*, 59
 Sedgwick's *Horace, a Biography*, 103
 Seitzman (C.) on Cahn's *Griechische Münzen archaischer Zeit*, 139
 Sherlock's *The Syntax of the Nominal Forms of the Verb, exclusive of the Participle*, in St. Hilary, 143
 Sherwin-White (A. N.) on Haarhoff's *The Stranger at the Gate*, 126
 Skopje, *Annuaire of the Faculty of Philosophy in the University of*, 42
 Sleeman (J. H.) on Westerink's *Michael Psellus, De Omnifaria Doctrina*, 57
 Snell's *Antike und Abendland*, 32
 Staehelin's *Die Schweiz in römischer Zeit* (third edition), 130
 Stanford (W. B.) A reconsideration of the Problem of the Axes in *Odyssey* XXI, 3
 Statius' metrical treatment of proper names, 50
stella, 8
 Stevens (P. T.) *In summa*, 91
 SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS, 37, 75, 145
 Taccone's *Sofocle: Filottete*, 71
 Tarn's *Alexander the Great*, 122
 Tarrant (D.) *Plato, Phaedo* 115 d: 44
 Tate (J.) on Gigon's *Sokrates, sein Bild in Dichtung und Geschichte*, 18; on *Festschrift für Edouard Tieche*, 31; on *Yale Classical Studies* (X), 69; on van Otterlo's *De Ringcompositie als Opbouwprincipe in de Gedichten van Homer*, 137
 Thompson (D'A. W.) on de Saint-Denis's *Le vocabulaire des animaux marins en latin classique*, 29
 Thompson (E. A.) on Walbank's *The Decline of the Roman Empire in the West*, 65
 Thompson's (E. A.) *A History of Attila and the Huns*, 66
 Thomson (G.) Bad Bronze again, 49
 Thomson's (J. A. K.) *The Classical Background of English Literature*, 67
 Thomson (J. O.) on Biliński's *De Apollodoreis in Pliniana Graeciae descriptione obviis*, 143
 Thomson's (J. O.) *History of Ancient Geography*, 111
 Tieche (E.), *Festschrift for*, 31
 Tilley's *Vergil's Latinum*, 26
 Tod (M. N.), seventieth birthday of, 1
 trade, Greek pre-colonial, 113
 Turner (E. G.) on Bell's *Egypt from Alexander the Great to the Arab Conquest*, 127
 van den Berg's *Anonymus de obsidione toleranda*, 36
 van der Ploeg's *Theramenes en zijn Tijd*, 30
 van de Weerd (H.), *Festschrift for*, 2
 van Effenterre's *La Crète et le monde grec de Platon à Polyebe*, 63
 van Otterlo's *De Ringcompositie als Opbouwprincipe in de epische Gedichten van Homer*, 137
 vase-painting, 42, 83, 132, 144
 Vollgraff (C. G.), essays dedicated to, 142
 Walbank (F. W.) on Cardona's *Polibio di Megalopoli: Storie*, 139
 Walbank's *The Decline of the Roman Empire in the West*, 65
 Watt (W. S.) Cornelius Nepos XXV 18 5: 90
 Webster (T. B. L.) on Lane's *Greek Pottery*, 132; on *Studia varia Carolo Gulielmo Vollgraff a discipulis oblati*, 142; on Beazley's *Some Attic Vases in the Cyprus Museum*, 144
 Webster's *Political Interpretations in Greek Literature*, 98
 Wegener's *Some Oxford Papyri—Plates*, 25
 Westerink's *Michael Psellus, De Omnifaria Doctrina*, 57
 Westlake (H. D.) The Aftermath of the Lamian War, 87; on Lesky's *Thalatta: Der Weg der Griechen zum Meer*, 117
 Wikgren's *Hellenistic Greek Texts*, 34
 Wilkins's *Eternal Lawyer*, 58
 Wilkinson (L. P.) Lucretius and the Love-philtre, 47
 Winbolt's *Britain under the Romans*, 140
 Winnington-Ingram (R. P.) on Zürcher's *Die Darstellung des Menschen im Drama des Euripides*, 15; on Butts's *The Glorification of Athens in Greek Drama*, 33; on Staiger's *Euripides, Ion*, 71; on Earp's *The Style of Aeschylus*, 95
 Winnington-Ingram's *Euripides and Dionysius*, 96
 Wolfson's *Philo*, 24
 Wright (T. E.) on Sedgwick's *Horace, a Biography*, 103
 Yale Classical Studies (X), 69
 Young (D. C. C.) on Brennan's *A Study of the Clausulae in the Sermons of St. Augustine*, 73
 Zeus Seleukeios, 92
 Zürcher's *Die Darstellung des Menschen im Drama des Euripides*, 15

II. INDEX LOCORUM

- Note—'passim' means that several passages of the author or work are dealt with at the given place
- Aeneas Tacticus xviii 10: 5
 Aeschylus *A.* 390-3; 49, 505, 679: 46; 1066-7, 1180: 96; 1580: 95. *Ch.* 546, 898: 95. *Eu.* 628: 95
 Apollonius Rhodius iv 957: 4 f.
 Appian *BC* i 80, 81, 87-92, 110: 52
 Apuleius *Met.* passim: 61 f.; *Met.* iii 9, 13: 28
 Aristophanes *Ach.* 849 ff.: 55. *Av.* 652: 44. *Ec.* 321: 6. *Eq.* 424: 7; 1151: 45. *Lys.* 519-20: 7. *Pax* 164-72: 10 f.; 700 ff.: 55. *Ra.* 85-7: 45; 713: 52. *Th.* 855-7: 81. *V.* passim: 6 f.
 Aristotle *Ath.* 43 2: 120. *EE* 1216^a-16-22: 102. *EN* 1097^b14 ff.: 103; 1133^a-28: 85; 1138^b18-1139^b13: 103; 1152^b25: 102; 1153^a7, 1153^b8-12: 102. *Pr.* 859^a15, 891^a26 f.: 82
 Athenaeus xiii 604 a-b: 83
 Caesar *BG* iv 17 9: 8

Cal
 Cic
 Col
 Crit
 Dem
 Dio
 Dio
 Dion
 pa
 Don
 Eur
 Cy
 H
 fr
 From
 Gelli
 Hero
 Herod
 ii
 23
 Hesi
 Hipp
 54
 Hom
 63
 v 2
 xix
 420
 Horac
 19
 Iamb
 IG 12
 10
 Jeron
 Juven
 Livy
 Luca
 Lucre
 LXX
 Lydu
 Macro
 Marti
 Nepo
 Nicam
 Nov.
 v 1
 46

δύραφ
 γράψι,
 θημοκ
 διοπτε
 δρύσοχ
 ἀλητί,
 λέων,
 ἔμετοι,
 εὐθαιρε

- vocabu-
-e, 29
-ne of the
Huns, 66
ound of
oreis in
phy, 111

nder the
unda, 36
Platon à
principe

Megal-
re in the
o
132; on
iscipulis
es in the
Litera-

Doctrina,
an War,
hen zum

alitire, 47
Die Dar-
ides, 15;
n Greek
-71; on
sius, 96

phy, 103

y of the
-73
Drama

place
52. Th.
02. EN
1139^b 13;
02. Pr.
- Callimachus *Hymn.* i 18: 3
Cicero *Arch.* 9: 53. *Att.* i 13 4: 29; xiii 52 1: 81. *Brut.*
60, 72: 48. *Dom.* 40: 14. *Leg.* i 58-63: 35. *ND* i
12 30: 24. *Part. Or.* 18 63: 109. *Prov. Cons.* 36: 14.
Rep. passim: 107. *Sen.* 50: 48. *Tusc.* v 5: 35
CIL iv 3878: 29
Columella xi 2: 9
Cratinus passim: 55
Critias fr. 4 15 d: 46
Democritus 13, 58, 176, 185, 292 Diehls: 46
Dio xxxix 33 2: 14 f.
Diodorus Siculus xiv 16 1: 10; xviii passim: 88 ff.
Dionysius Halicarnassensis i 72 3: 27; ix and x
passim: 56 f. *Dem.* 4-5. *Lys.* 5: 109
Donatus ad *Ter. Ad.* 537: 49
Euripides *Arc.* 955 ff.: 15. *Ba.* 519 f.: 82; 895-6: 98.
Cyc. 394, 402-4: 49. *El.* 1182 ff.: 15. *Hec.* 153,
HF 573, 784-7. *Hel.* 1-3: 81-3. *IT* 753-4: 49.
fr. 228 3: 82
Frontinus *Strat.* i 12: 52
Gellius xvii 21 45: 48
Herodian iii 4 8 f.: 46
Herodotus i 65, 77: 46; ii 94: 85; i 113: 46; ii 138: 81;
ii 11, 26, 43, 120: 46; ii 77: 81; vi 109, vii 157, 218,
237; viii 10, 60: 46
Hesiod *Th.* 520: 50
Hippocrates *Art.* 40: 82. *Prorrh.* ii 43: 81. *VM* 15:
54
Homer *Il.* ii 723: 50; xiv 230-1, 249-62: 83 f.; xv
630, xvii 21: 50; *Od.* i 52: 50; ii 91: 46; iv 231: 81;
v 236: 5; vi 297: 46; x 137, xi 322: 50; xiii 380: 46;
xix 540, 552, 572-5, xx 257-8, xxi 3, 10, 61, 120-3,
420-3, xxii 9, 74: 3 ff.
Horace *C.* i 33: 105; ii 3 11: 7; ii 11: 103; iii 27 6, 29
19: 8. *Ep.* i 4: 105; i 8 12: 104; i 10 21: 8
Iamblichus *VP* 88: 43
IG i² 27 13-17: 11; i² 28 7-13: 10 f.; i² 56 14-17: 9, 11;
i² 154 10-11: 12; i² 324: 121; ii² 32 9: 12; ii² 32
10-11: 10; ii² 38 1-5: 10; ii² 73 7-8: 12
Jerome sub ann. 94 a.c.: 47
Juvenal iii 76-80: 91
Livy xxxviii 20: 139; *Epit.* lxxiv: 52
Lucian iv 117: 8
Lucretius i 132-3, iii 828-9, iv 33-7: 47 f.; vi 1114: 81
LXX *Jd.* xx 36: 46, *4Ki.* xviii 5
Lydus *Mag.* iii 48: 67. *Mens.* i 13: 27
Macrobius *Somn.* *Scip.* i 14: 8
Martial iii 58 40: 13
Nepos *Att.* 4 12: 47; 18 5: 90
Nicander *Ther.* 387: 5
Nov. *Test. Matt.* xii 21, *Jo.* v 45, *Rom.* iv 18,
v 12-13, *x Cor.* xiii 7, *Eph.* ii 12, *x Pet.* iii 5:
46
- OGIS i: 123
Ovid *Am.* ii 16 4: 9. *F.* iii 793, v 112: 9. *Her.* vi 87:
8. *Met.* i 39, ix 18: 8. *R. Am.* 121: 8. *Tr.* iv 10 6:
104
Petronius passim: 12 f., 28, 91, 70 f.: 74
Philo *de Gigantibus* 8: 25
Pindar N. vii 20: 46. *P.* viii 8 ff.: 33. fr. 50 Bowra:
46
Plato *Ap.* 30 a-b, 36 c, 38 a-b: 44. *Grg.* 508 d, 514 e,
527 a: 45. *Hp. Ma.* 293 a: 45. *Ion* 535 b: 3. *Lg.*
638 c: 55; 644 c: 46; 782 c, 962 e: 45. *Ly.* 205 d,
221 c: 45. *Phd.* 98 b, 107 d, 108 c, 115: 44. *Phlb.*
13 d, 16 b-c, 36 d: 43 f. *Prt.* 309 c, 340 a: 44 f.
R. passim: 43 ff. *Tht.* 176 b, 183 d: 44 f.
Plautus passim: 73. *Bacch.* 214. *Cist.* 202: 48
Pliny *NH* v 13: 50; xviii 271: 9; xxv 25: 47; xxvi 8:
81; xxxv 196-8: 51 f.
Pliny *Epp.* i 12 12, iii 4 8, iv 15 11, v 1 3, v 6 42,
viii 4 8: 92
Plutarch *Caes.* 7 i: 52. *Cat. mi.* 43 i: 14. *Crass.* 6:
52; 16 2: 1. *Demetr.* II, 13: 124. *Luc.* 43: 47.
Lys. 17: 86. *Mar.* 42: 52. *Pomp.* 52 4: 15. *Servi.*
19, 21, 22: 52. *Them.* 2 4: 99
Polybius xii 3 b 2: 139
Procopius *Goth.* viii 11 27 ff.: 66
Quintilian xii passim: 108
Sallust *Cat.* 50 1-3: 59
Seneca *Contr.* vii 2 3, ix 2 27: 109
Seneca *NQ* i 16: 47
Silius Italicus xv 621-3: 8
Sophocles *Ant.* 186: 99. *OC* 1105: 46. *Ph.* 391 ff.,
827 ff.: 84. *Tr.* 974-82, 988-91, 1004-6, 1010,
1040-2: 85
Spartianus *Hadrian.* 10: 52
Statius passim: 50 f. *Ach.* i 84 f., 151 f.: 50
Strabo xv 751-2: 94; xvi 826: 50
Suetonius *Caes.* 23 I, 24 I, 28 2: 14
Tacitus *Agr.* 10 6: 94. *A.* xii 53 2-3: 28; xiv 16 i: 91.
H. iv 25: 29
Terence *Ad.* 165, 395-6, *Eun.* 1051-2, *Heaut.* 473:
73
Theocritus ii 62, 165, xv 99: 71
Theognis 449-50: 49
Theophrastus *Char.* 21 6: 42
Thucydites passim: 17 f.; ii 89, iii 14, iii 97: 46
Tibullus iii 5 18: 104; iv 2-6: 106
Trag. *Adesp.* 118 2: 46
Valerius Flaccus i 484: 8
Varro *LL* vii 54: 49
Velleius ii 46 2: 15
Virgil *Aen.* xii 43-5: 27. *G.* i 222, 336: 9
Xenophon *HG* i 7 15: 63. *Lac.* I, 14, 15: 99. *Mem.*
i 6 14, iii 7: 18

III. INDEX OF GREEK WORDS

- | | | | |
|----------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|-------------------|
| ἄγραφοις νόμοι, 125 | ἰσονομία, 125 | μελαμπαγής, 49 | Σελεύκειος, 93 |
| γράῦς, 45 | κατά θέον, 121 | μεμνονίδες, 43 | σιδερομένοι, 141 |
| δημοκρατία, 31, 125 | κατ' ἀρχοντα, 121 | νόμομα 'specie', 85 | οἴδηρος, 4 |
| διοιστένειν, 3 | κορυδός, 42 | οβέλισκοι, 86 | οίκουντις, 144 |
| δρύσογις, 4 | λεγομένος, 45 | ούγκιον, 4 | οτειλεῖται, 4 f. |
| ἔπιτις, ἔπων, ἔπομαι, ἔπι- | λέπτρα, 81 | οὐλοφόρων, 50 | ονταξίς, 123 |
| ζεν, 46 | λεύκη, 81 | πλέκεν, 4 | ουρματισμός, 81 |
| ἔμετοι, 82 | λιτήν ἐκβάλλειν, 141 | πλάσμα 'person', 141 | φρόνησις, 21, 102 |
| εὐδάμων, 45 | μάκαρ, 45 | προσκύνησις, 124 | |

- | | | | |
|-------------------|--|--|--|
| σιδερομένοι, 141 | | | |
| οἴδηρος, 4 | | | |
| οίκουντις, 144 | | | |
| οτειλεῖται, 4 f. | | | |
| ονταξίς, 123 | | | |
| ουρματισμός, 81 | | | |
| φρόνησις, 21, 102 | | | |

PRINTED IN
GREAT BRITAIN
AT THE
UNIVERSITY PRESS
OXFORD
BY
CHARLES BATEY
PRINTER
TO THE
UNIVERSITY

